c.a.u.t. bulletin

APRIL
1968
AVRIL

bulletin de l'a.c.p.u.

Report on Simon Fraser University

Conseil des Arts du Canada : Humanités et Sciences Sociales

Subventions du Conseil National de Recherches

University — Government Relations : Ontario College of Art

Association News — Communications

VOLUME 16 NUMBER 4
TOME NUMÉRO

A PUBLICATION OF THE CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS
PUBLIÉ PAR L'ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE DES PROFESSEURS D'UNIVERSITÉ

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

Association	*President*	*Secretary*	*Treasurer*
1. Acadia	Ernest E. Zinck	Margaret Shepherd	Wolfgang Bottenberg
2. Alta. Edmonton	G. O. Mackie	A. S. Little	A. S. Knowler
3. Bishop's	Dan Patridge	M. Rhodes	R. Barnett
4. Brandon	L. S. Evans	J. W. Cotts	A. Rogosin
5. U.B.C.	N. A. Hall	Mrs. Anne Brearley	R. D. Russell
6. Brock	Richard Hiatt	Howard E. Bell	Howard E. Bell
7. Calgary	H. Buckmaster	Horst Betz	P. G. Glockner
8. Carleton	P. E. Uren	S. R. Mealing	D. K. Bernhardt
9. Dalhousie	Mark Segal	J. Farley	M. Kirby
10. Guelph	J. B. Robinson	E. C. Hunt	J. P. Mokanski
11. Jean-de-Brébeuf	R. Bergeron	Gisèle Gariépy (Sœur)	
12. Lakehead	John Whitfield	Evelyn Eager	Douglas Alexander
13. Laurentian-Laurentienne	Gerald Vallillee	Michel Perrault	K. L. McNamara
14. Loyola	J. T. Copp	Daniel Brown	Robert Hanrahan
15. Manitoba	I. R. Hamilton	E. C. Moulton	K. M. Hughes
16. McGill	William A. Westley	Frank Innes	R. M. Johnstone
17. McMaster	G. S. French	Lynn McDonald (Miss)	L. I. Greenspan
18. Memorial	J. Tague	N. Veitch	J. A. Cook
19. Moncton	Léandre Desjardins	Claude Bouchard	Léandre-J. Bourque
20. Montréal	Serge Lapointe	V. Adamkiewiecz	Jacques Falmagne
21. Mount Allison	K. Durstling	D. W. Cross	D. W. Cross
22. U. New Brunswick	D. R. Pullman	Rylys Cutler (Miss)	D. D. Kristmanson
23. N.S. Tech.	G. D. MacKay	E. A. Guppy	E. A. Guppy
24. Ottawa	George Ling	Jean Vaillancourt	Emilio Binavince
25. Queen's	A. A. Travil	J. Downie	G. P. Raymond
26. R.M.C.	D. H. Rogers	F. J. Y. Gallays	M. Chaudry
27. St. Dunstan's	Fred Driscoll	G. W. Pineau	G. W. Pineau
28. St. Francis X	D. Bunbury	J. Ross	J. Ross
29. St. John's	Rv. A. M. C. Waterman	J. C. Wenk	D. Niemi
30. St. Mary's	Richard Beis	R. Marshall	R. Marshall
31. St. Paul's	W. R. Wall	J. E. Rea	J. E. Rea
32. Sask. Regina	R. Robinson	P. J. Hammel	M. Alexander (Miss)
33. Sask. Saskatoon	J. M. Naylor	T. G. Smith	J. C. Courtney
34. Simon Fraser	K. Okuda	Chas. MacDonald	John Barlow
35. Sir Geo. Wms.	Frank Chalk	M. Marsden	M. Marsden
36. Toronto	M. F. Grapko	E. Schabas	R. A. Collins
37. Trent	Bruce Hodgins	Alan Wilson	J. Nighswander
38. Victoria	I. D. Pal	F. P. Robinson	R. Powers
39. Waterloo	Rob't Y. M. Huang	J. B. Capindale	F. J. Byerley
40. Waterloo Lutheran	Sidney Hellyer	Arnold A. Wellwood	Janet Hay
41. Western	B. B. Kymlicka	J. Warwick	W. Bulani
42. Windsor	David Robinson	Gordon Wood	D. Pillay
43. Winnipeg	H. V. Rutherford	S. G. Wall	R. B. Coates
44. York	Lewis Hertzman	Kathryn Koenig	Harvey Simmons
45. Members-at-large — membres individuels			

association	*président*	*secrétaire*	*trésorier*

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE DES PROFESSEURS D'UNIVERSITÉ

c.a.u.t. bulletin

bulletin de l'a.c.p.u.

A Publication of The Canadian Association of University Teachers
Publié par l'Association canadienne des professeurs d'université

Executive Secretary: J. Percy Smith
Secrétaire général:

Editor: Edward J. Monahan
Directeur:

C.A.U.T. National Office
77 Metcalfe St., Ottawa 4, Ont.
Advertising Office:
77 Metcalfe St., Ottawa 4, Ontario

Secrétariat de l'A.C.P.U.,
77, rue Metcalfe, Ottawa 4, Ont.
Publicité :

April 1968 avril

Volume 16, Number 4 — tome 16, numéro 4

TABLE OF CONTENTS — TABLE DES MATIÈRES

		Page
Editorial		2
Report on Simon Fraser University		4
Conseil des Arts du Canada : Humanités et Sciences Sociales 1966-1967	Mireille Lapointe	29
Subventions du Conseil National de Recherches 1964-1965, 1965-1966, 1966-1967	Mireille Lapointe	39
Would Collective Bargaining Increase Academic Salaries ?	A. J. Robinson	70
University—Government Relations : A Case in Point	J. Percy Smith	78
Academic Freedom and Tenure, A.A.U.P. Handbook	J. B. Milner	82
Memoire de l'A.C.P.U. à la Commission d'étude Munroe sur les statistiques de l'éducation du Bureau fédéral de la statistique		87
Book Reviews — Notes de lecture		
The University Game	E. J. Monahan	114
Notice of Positions Vacant — Annonce des postes vacants		118
Notice of Persons Available for Appointment — Annonce des Professeurs disponibles		121

Published four times a year in October, December, February and April.
Subscription Rate : $5.00 per year.

Quatre livraisons par année : octobre, décembre, février et avril.
L'abonnement est de $5.00 par année.

Imprimé par : Printed by : LE DROIT Ottawa, Ont. 89

Authorized as second class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa and for payment of postage in cash.

Le ministère des Postes a autorisé l'affranchissement en numéraire et l'envoi comme objet de deuxième classe de la présente publication.

EDITORIAL

IT'S STILL EVERYBODY'S HEADACHE

At the time of its publication several years ago an editorial in this journal elicited considerable comment. Entitled, It's Everybody's Headache, *it was a plea for greater support by faculty members of the C.A.U.T.*

Since that time membership in the Association has increased substantially, both in absolute numbers and in terms of the percentage of those eligible. Though no precise figures are available on either the total number of full-time faculty members in Canada or the total number of members of the C.A.U.T. (thereby illustrating the pressing need to improve statistical services), we reckon that the Association currently numbers some 10,300 members, about 80% of those eligible to join.

This is a sizeable majority of university faculty members in Canada and lends considerable weight to the Association's claim to be able to speak on behalf of this group. Moreover, with the steady increase in membership and the concurrent increase in Association revenues, we have been able to undertake a growing number of activities on behalf of the university faculty community.

However, like any individual or group, when it comes to finances we face continually the need to count costs. The C.A.U.T. has always taken the view — and we would not wish it otherwise — that the Association exists for service to the entire university community. Therefore, we have never made membership in the Association, by an individual faculty member or a faculty association, a condition for our providing service.

For example, the services of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure are available to anyone who seeks them. If a complaint is lodged with the Committee, the decision whether or not to act upon it is made on the Committee's judgment about the intrinsic merits of the case, not on the basis of whether the person or association filing the complaint is a member of the C.A.U.T. What action is taken of course depends to some extent upon the available resources of the Association.

For the information (and perhaps edification) of C.A.U.T. members, it might be pointed out that a considerable number of the complaints handled by the AF&T Committee come from individuals who are not members of the Association. To such individuals of course the comment can appropriately be made that, if a majority of their faculty colleagues had shown as little concern for the support of their organization as they had, the C.A.U.T. would not exist to be of assistance to anyone.

It is the same with associations and institutions. This number of the Bulletin *contains the Report of the Milner Committee on Simon Fraser University and a brief account of the actions of the C.A.U.T. in connection with the Ontario College of Art.*

Such are circumstances at the College of Art that there is way in which individual faculty members at the college or the faculty association there can become members of the C.A.U.T. Yet the troubled history of that institution is one in which the C.A.U.T. became involved because the executive judged that there was a role for the Association to play on behalf of the larger faculty community.

As readers of this journal know, the activities of the C.A.U.T. on behalf of Simon Fraser University antedate the opening of the institution, going back to a time when there was not and could not be any formal relation between Simon Fraser and this Association. When last November the Council received a request from the newly affiliated Faculty Association at Simon Fraser to conduct an investigation of the University, then there was no hesitation to commit a sizeable amount of Association resources to this task.

We hope always to be in a position to respond affirmatively to requests for service when, in our judgment, these are significantly in the interests of the general Canadian university community. However, the ability to fulfill this hope will always depend to an important degree upon the resources immediately available to the Association.

The extent of these resources, which include both money and personnel, in turn depends upon the willingness of Canadian university faculty to support the Association. It is, then, still everybody's headache; and it always will be.

REPORT ON SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

by the

SPECIAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

of the

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS 9 FEBRUARY 1968

The following report is published here in accordance with the instructions of the Executive and Finance Committee, for the information of Association members and the Council which authorized the enquiry at Simon Fraser University. The Report was released in February to the Simon Fraser Faculty Association, the President of the University, and the Chairman of the Board of Governors. It was released to the press by the Faculty Association, and has received a good deal of public discussion in British Columbia.

President McTaggart-Cowan has commented that "the Report makes some excellent points which will receive full consideration by the University." Special meetings of the Faculty Association and the Senate considered the Report, and committees of the Senate have been established to study various aspects of its recommendations: the tenure and promotion policy; the constitution and function of the governing bodies of the University; the methods of appointment, tenure, and functions of Deans and Department Heads. The Chairman of the Board of Governors has claimed that the Report contains statements that are "misleading and defamatory"; the Board is studying the document, however.

We hope to be able to report further progress when the matter comes before the Council at its forthcoming May meeting.

A. *History and Background*

1. At a meeting on 18 October 1967 the Faculty Association of Simon Fraser University resolved that "the Faculty Association indicates its support to the Executive to call in Canadian Association of University Teachers to investigate the breakdown in communications between the Faculty Association and the President". The C.A.U.T. was almost immediately informed of the resolution. While the Executive of the Faculty Association which had recommended this investigation had

resigned over another issue, the newly-elected Executive brought forward the recommendation with its full support.

2. The C.A.U.T. is a federation of faculty associations in forty-four Canadian universities and colleges and has an individual membership of some 10,000 teachers. The governing body is the Council, which is composed of representatives from each local association. An Executive and Finance Committee of the Council is charged with supervision of the day-to-day administration by the Executive Secretary. The Association seeks to promote the interests of the university community of Canada, of which each faculty association and each individual member is a part.

3. On 25 November the Council, on the advice of the Executive and Finance Committee, unanimously instructed that Committee to accept the invitation of the Faculty Association of Simon Fraser University. The Executive and Finance Committee forthwith appointed a Special Investigating Committee, naming Professor J. B. Milner, of the Faculty of Law at the University of Toronto, and Professor J. Percy Smith, Executive Secretary of C.A.U.T. Professors Milner and Smith were authorized to add a third member, and it was their unanimous choice that Dean Alwyn Berland of the Regina Campus of the University of Saskatchewan be appointed. Dean Berland agreed and the Committee commenced its review of the Simon Fraser situation. The Committee was instructed to report, with its recommendations, to the Executive and Finance Committee, and the following report is submitted.

B. *Our Terms of Reference*

4. Our only terms of reference are to respond to the invitation from the Simon Fraser Faculty Association and we soon learned that the invitation followed the "spur of the moment" resolution that had been passed — 36 for, 18 against, with 1 abstention. The language is, we think, less precise than that which would have been used had the proposal received more prolonged consideration. In two respects we found that there was common understanding by Dr. Patrick McTaggart-Cowan, President of Simon Fraser University, * and the members of the Association with whom we talked.

---

* Dr. McTaggart-Cowan had a distinguished career as a meteorologist before becoming President of Simon Fraser University. He holds B.A. degrees from the University of British Columbia (1933) and from Oxford (1936), and an honorary D.Sc. from the former. He is the author of numerous scientific papers. At the time of his appointment as President, he was Director of Meteorological Services for Canada.

5. First, with respect to the "failure of communication", it was widely conceded that communication with Dr. McTaggart-Cowan, the President of Simon Fraser University, is uncommonly easy. His boast that his door is always open to Faculty members is no idle one. Indeed, many Faculty members reported that the President appeared to understand, and often to agree with, their communications. In this respect the problem is not "failure of communication". Rather, it is failure to get positive response to the Faculty's communications. It was readily conceded that not all communications could be expected to produce agreement and acceptable administrative action. But the Faculty Association, and, indeed, many individual Faculty members, told us that the incidence of failure to get acceptable administrative action is inordinately high.

6. Second, with respect to the "Faculty Association" and the "President", as the communicators, it soon became apparent that reference was being made both to the Faculty Association and to individual members of the Faculty, including academic administrators, both Department Heads and Deans. And the reference to the President included reference to the Board of Governors. In fact, we soon discovered that a possible cause of trouble at Simon Fraser University was the blurred distinction between the Faculty Association and the Faculty, on the one hand, and the President and the Board of Governors, on the other.

7. We think it should be quite clear, on any university campus, that there are certain jobs to be done by the faculty association, and that they do not unduly overlap with jobs that are done by faculty members as individuals or as members of committees. We conceive the job of a faculty association to be twofold. Its principal purpose is to promote the well-being of the university community. A subsidiary purpose is to protect the welfare of its members. In fulfilling these purposes it is concerned to explain to the lay members of the community and to the public the concept of the university as a place of liberty. Among its primary areas of concern are, of course, salaries, pensions, academic freedom and tenure, and university government. But a faculty association, as such, should not engage directly in university government. Rather, in this area, it acts as ombudsman, to identify and rectify instances of maladministration, and to participate forcefully in every attempt to improve administration.

8. Many of the particular matters that we investigated, which we report on later, are matters of university government. The "failure of communication", if that is the appropriate expression, was most frequently a failure between a university committee, or an individual Faculty member, and the President. In only a few cases did the failure involve the Faculty Association.

9. The involvement of the Board of Governors, as well as the President, is more difficult to describe. At this stage we need only say that some of the "failures of communication" turned out rather to be failures to achieve acceptable administrative actions because of intervention by the Board of Governors in matters that properly belong to the President. The President should have been guided by democratically established academic committees, since it seems to us that the President's primary responsibility is to represent the Faculty to the Board of Governors.

10. In one further respect the expression "failure of communication" needs some clarification. We discovered in a number of situations that the failure was "one way"; that is, that communication from a Faculty member to the President was frequently more successful than the replies, or even independent communications, from the President to the individual Faculty members. We should say that in some instances the failure may have been limited to internal departmental failure. Wherever the cause, we heard complaint that matters that the President had assured us had left his office had not, in fact, reached the assistant professors at the bottom of the heap, not forgetting instructors, lecturers and teaching assistants.

11. We concluded, after some inquiry, then, that our terms of reference were to investigate the failure of the administration at Simon Fraser University to take adequately into account the advice of its individual Faculty members and committees as well as the Faculty Association.

C. *The Committee's Procedure*

12. Apart from some preliminary correspondence with the President and the Faculty Association, the bulk of the Committee's work was done during a week-long visit on the campus of Simon Fraser University. The President provided us with a large room in the Academic Quadrangle, in which we held all our meetings except for two sessions with the President in his office and a couple of informal meetings off the campus with the Executive of the Faculty Association.

13. On our arrival on Sunday, January 14th, we took an unheralded tour of the Campus on our own. As is well known, Simon Fraser University exists in lonely splendour in a park at the top of Burnaby Mountain, nearly four miles by road from the Lougheed Highway. Public transportation is barely adequate and parking is provided for thousands of cars. The buildings so far erected are dominated by the Library, the Mall and the Academic Quadrangle, on the sixth floor of which are located most of the Faculty offices. Classrooms are below, and there is also a "science complex" of labs and classrooms running down the side of the hill, as does the Theatre. There are a gymnasium, a men's residence (Shell House), and a women's residence (Madge Hogarth House).

14. There is a Shell Service Station off the perimeter road away from the present parking lots, located so as to enjoy a magnificent view of the north slope of the mountain from a man-made viewpoint. Its location has been a sorepoint of contention and, we think, some misunderstanding. It is built on land leased for twenty-five years, and it could after that time be demolished and relocated in a more suitable place. We confess that we are at a loss to understand by what principles of university campus planning it was given its present location.

15. The University was conceived in the summer of 1963. Construction began on the present site in April 1964 and in September 1965 the University registered 2,500 students, more than were enrolled at the University of British Columbia when it had been in existence for 25 years. Two and a half years later, in January 1968, the registration was up to 5,200, and because the University runs a trimester year, a total of 7,200 students are presently in some stage of their university education at Simon Fraser. This unprecedented growth, while a matter of some pride, is a basic cause for the malaise we found in some parts of the Faculty. Indeed, it is all too common to excuse gross faults in administration by pointing to this rapid growth and the University's undeniable accomplishments. Without wishing to denigrate a fine performance, we think we must point out that the headaches of growth cannot excuse all errors of administration at all times, or some at any time. There is a danger that the administration will fall into a habit of excusing itself long after the excuse has ceased to have any validity. It is the clear responsibility of the Faculty Association to see that this prolongation does not happen.

16. The administration established to handle this growth differs from the typical Canadian university government in two significant ways. Within the Simon Fraser University structure the dominant administrators are the President and the Heads of Departments, all of whom, of necessity, were appointed before the rest of the Faculty was found. The arrangement provides for a single President and some twenty-five Heads, very loosely organized into Faculties of Arts, Science and Education, with part-time Deans holding office for one year and replaced by election of the Faculty. This somewhat feudal structure raises a suspicion that some principle of "divide and conquer" might have been in the mind of Dr. Gordon Shrum, * who frequently, we were told, speaks in Senate of what he "had in mind" when the University was being established. Dr. Shrum is the Chancellor of the University, ordinarily an essentially honorific post; he is also Chairman of the Board of Governors, a more significant post which can be made a base of considerable influence on university affairs. Whether the suspicion is true or not is irrelevant here — the fact that the suspicion exists, and that many members of Faculty distrust what they call "absentee management", is distressingly relevant to our inquiry.

17. A recent reorganization of the administration provides for full-time Deans, as what have been described officially as "line officers". This strengthening of the Faculties is a welcome introduction. It is only too characteristic of university government at Simon Fraser, however, that this change, introduced by the Board and President as recently as 5 November 1967, makes no provision for limited terms for the new Deans. It thus extends the difficulties that the Duff/Berdahl Report on *University Government in Canada* sought to reduce by the device of limited terms. Although the new Deans will doubtless be appointed without "tenure", and could, theoretically, be removed from office in, say, five years, no such understanding has been reached with either the Department Heads or the Dean of Science who has just been appointed.

18. It is difficult to understand why, in a university conceived of while the Duff/Berdahl inquiry was under way, basic administrative appoint-

---

* Dr. Gordon Shrum, Chairman of the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority, has had a long and distinguished career. He is a University of Toronto alumnus (B.A. 1920; M.A. 1921; Ph.D. 1923), is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, and has honorary degrees from the University of British Columbia and McMaster University. He served in the Department of Physics at U.B.C., 1925-1961, and was Head of that Department, 1938-1961. He was Dean of Graduate Studies, 1956-1961. He commanded the U.B.C. contingent of the C.O.T.C., 1937-1946. He has been a prominent member of many scientific, educational, and other bodies. He played a prominent role in bringing Simon Fraser University into being, and he is its first Chancellor.

ments were made without regard to the ideas later embodied in the Duff/Berdahl Report, and currently understood in university circles by anyone capable of guiding the establishment of a new university. What harm has been done to the effective operation of Simon Fraser University by the failure to recognise the value of limited terms for university administrators is hard to measure; but it is quite clear that had attention been given to current thinking in 1964 and 1965, the problems of 1967 and 1968 might never have occurred.

19. The other atypical administrative device is the division of the academic year of twelve months into trimesters of four months each, or sixteen weeks: the Spring, from January to April; the Summer, from May to August; and the Fall, from September to December. Students may enter at the beginning of any trimester. Each trimester is an entity in itself with complete courses and final examinations. The student may thus choose a variety of combinations to complete his required time. He may take the Fall trimester, work at a job during the winter (Spring trimester) and return to his studies during the Summer trimester, when competition for student jobs in British Columbia is at its peak.

20. The trimester system, which has been critically reviewed by the C.A.U.T. Committee on Year-Round Operation of Universities in its Final Report, published as a special issue of C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. *Bulletin* in September 1964, places a great strain on both students and faculty in a variety of ways. It was especially noticeable to us that communications among the faculty were more difficult because some members of a department were off during each of the three trimesters. In the one or two-term year, more common in Canadian universities, most of the faculty are likely to be on the campus during the fall and spring, and those who go away for research or study have to choose the summer. Not only does the trimester system make communications between administration and Faculty members more difficult, it has the unfortunate result of reinforcing the authoritarian administration we found so characteristic of Simon Fraser. It is inevitable that decisions will have to be taken by those who are on campus, and the irregular choice of research trimesters by various Faculty members within a Department or Faculty makes continuity of a committee over a six-months period awkward enough that the busy administrator loses his taste for consulting his colleagues.

21. We must emphasize the point that the trimester during which the professor does not teach is not "holiday time". By the explicit terms of

the Faculty Handbook, "faculty members are expected to teach two terms each year, the third term being a research semester." "Faculty members are also expected to remain abreast of scholarly development in their primary fields of interest." As to holidays the Handbook is equally explicit: unlike their brethren in high schools, who are given two months, "Faculty are entitled to one month's holiday each year, to be taken during the research semester (sic)".

22. In view of this required commitment to eleven months of teaching and scholarship out of every twelve, it is not surprising that some Faculty members drew our attention to what they called "Chancellor Shrum's gratuitous insults to the Faculty" reported in the *Province* newspaper of 27 October 1967. Chairman Shrum is there reported to have said, after stating the floor salaries at Simon Fraser, "That's not a bad salary for eight months a year". Fairness to Chairman Shrum, whom we did not ask to deny this report, requires that we draw attention to a further provision in the Handbook, that "The University will not object if faculty members are paid for work done during their research semesters (sic) if their remunerative activity is generally beneficial to their professional career and does not hinder their efficiency when they return to teaching at Simon Fraser University". Whether the work is beneficial is the decision of the Department Head. Undoubtedly some Faculty members, particularly from the sciences, may obtain remunerative employment; but many others will be lucky to get research assistance sufficient to meet expenses, and still others will find it quite impossible to augment their income in any way. A university that expects its Faculty to rely on outside earnings as a regular source of income inevitably will have many frustrated and disappointed Faculty members. They are not likely to appreciate the description of their year as one of "eight months".

23. During our week on the Campus we held interviews from Monday morning until Friday evening. We saw some thirty Faculty members, most of whom were from the Faculty of Arts, but there were a few from the Faculty of Science and the Faculty of Education. Nine of them held, or had held, administrative positions, as Deans or Heads of Departments. Three of them represented the "Union", a recently organized group of Faculty members who have said that they would consider asking for certification as the Faculty representatives in compulsory bargaining under the British Columbia Labour Act. According to some legal gossip, the Act does not regard university teachers as "employees" within the meaning of the Act, while other gossip, presumably equally

valid, holds that they are employees. We met with two Teaching Assistants, another group also contemplating union action, and three students. We had two long sessions with the President and two sessions and a lunch with the Executive of the Faculty Association.

24. We did not meet any member of the Board of Governors. When we arrived, the President informed us that the Board had considered whether it should meet with us and it had decided not to. Notwithstanding this decision, we felt that individual members of the Board might appreciate an interview, and our Chairman accordingly asked the President's executive assistant, Mr. Allan Smith, to extend an invitation on our behalf to each member of the Board individually. Not hearing from Mr. Smith, Professor Smith phoned two days later and learned that our invitations had not been sent. After undertaking to send them, Mr. Smith spoke to the President about it, and the President evidently told him not to do so. While this slight discourtesy from the President's office was quite offset by his hospitality generally, we mention the experience as an illustration of inexplicable reactions of the sort that we heard complained of by several Faculty members. Admittedly we did not know that any Board members would ask to see us, but, in view of the diplomatic character of our visit, we felt it desirable to have them know we were quite ready to see them.

25. It should be clear to everyone that we did not assume the role of arbitrators. While we made every reasonable effort to check the accuracy of the "facts" related to us, we do not make findings of fact as adjudicators. We sat in judgment on no one. We tried, at every opportunity, to explain the position taken by the President, as we understood it, to the Faculty members with whom we talked, and, in turn, we tried to explain their position to the President. Generously mixed with both explanations were our own notions about the undoubted unhappiness of some of the Faculty.

26. Our general impression from our many interviews is that the concern of the Faculty Association is justified. There is a serious malaise amongst the Faculty of Simon Fraser University, and while it is largely concentrated in the Faculty of Arts, and especially in the Department of Psychology, those unhappy Faculty members have sympathisers in the other Faculties as well. On the other hand, while the complaints appeared to us to have solid foundations, we feel that the state of Simon Fraser is by no means irreparable, and we have every hope that, with good will on both sides, the Faculty and the Administration can get on with the very important job of making a reality of the

ideals set by the University and shared, it was quite evident, by many of the young, and perhaps idealistic, Faculty members that have been attracted from around the English-speaking world.

27. The state of affairs at Simon Fraser is undoubtedly attributable in part to the large number of inexperienced Faculty members from different academic backgrounds. A statement dated 22 December 1967 (before the new staff for the Spring trimester, 1968 had arrived) showed that there were only 33 professors and 44 associate professors on the fulltime staff, but there were 160 assistant professors and 74 instructors. The associate and full professors are not notably aged; the difference in experience between the "senior staff" and the "junior staff" was not, in most instances, so great as to ensure distinction and respect for the "senior staff" (if age and experience any longer have that effect). Further, regardless of age and experience, the "senior staff" have no more seniority at Simon Fraser University than the juniors. No one has been teaching at Simon Fraser for more than two and a half years.

28. The different academic backgrounds, where only one quarter of the Faculty is Canadian, have also provided difficulties of adjustment. There are far fewer teachers at Simon Fraser from Canadian than from either United Kingdom or American backgrounds. The resulting collision of different attitudes has produced greater difficulties because there are few established practices that could be quickly learned and accepted. In the absence of settled rules, newcomers quite naturally continue with the rules and practices they know and understand, and in the hurry of establishing a University with 5,200 students within thirty months, communications sometimes fail.

29. Having said this, and having accepted it as an explanation, if not a justification, for much of the confusion and frustration contributing to the unhappiness of many Faculty members, we must add that, in our view, there are a number of matters that could easily be improved to the advantage of both the Faculty and the Administration. Some of these matters are discussed next, in our comments on specific issues.

D. *Comments on Specific Issues*

(a) Appointments and tenure procedures

30. We were told by more than one of the "senior staff" with whom we spoke that if the contract renewal procedures could be clarified and rationalized a large part of Simon Fraser's troubles would be overcome. The concern about appointments and tenure at Simon Fraser strikes

a familiar chord in the C.A.U.T. As early as 30 November 1963, the late Professor Stewart Reid, then Executive Secretary of the C.A.U.T., wrote to Chairman Shrum to inquire about the policy of Simon Fraser University in the matter of tenure. It had been reported to Professor Reid that Chairman Shrum had told the U.B.C. Faculty Association that he was opposed to the principle of tenure, saw no point in it, and went so far as to say that if a candidate for a teaching position mentioned the matter to him, such a person would not be appointed at Simon Fraser. Chairman Shrum replied to Professor Reid on 6 December 1963, saying, in part, "So far, this question [of tenure] has not arisen. None of those whom we have appointed or interviewed has raised it and none of the thirty or forty applications we have received has made any reference to security of appointment. At a time when there is a desperate shortage of University teachers, it seems an anomaly that there should be any valid concern about this matter".

31. Notwithstanding this curious reply, in due course Simon Fraser adopted Provisional Terms of Appointment for Academic Staff that are still in the Faculty Handbook and provide, in a way, for tenure. After a period of three years (in the case of a professor), four years (associate professor), or seven years (assistant professor), a Faculty member "will become eligible" for tenure or "appointment without term". But "appointment without term" will not be given automatically, or necessarily, even after a review by the President and Board of Governors of the candidate's record as a lecturer and scholar. Simon Fraser University "wishes to state very clearly" that it does not subscribe to the "up or out" philosophy. Hence, despite his eligibility for tenure, a professor, associate professor or assistant professor may find himself the recipient of further two- or three-year appointments. We think that what is involved in such an arrangement is not an "up or out" philosophy, but an evasion of a proper "in or out" regulation. It is absurd to speak of an "up or out" philosophy that governs full professors.

32. It should hardly be necessary to stress here that this set of substitutions for a proper tenure policy is unacceptable to the C.A.U.T. The Association has stated its position clearly in its recent Policy Statement on Academic Appointments and Tenure. According to that Statement, "Contracts for limited terms are undesirable except for special purposes and should not be substituted for probationary appointments". On the other hand, tenure is not something to be "awarded". It is a required protection for academic freedom and should be the basis of any appointment after a probationary term.

33. If Simon Fraser University were to adopt this attitude toward tenure, and to discard its present series of short-term appointments, its current problems with "contract renewals" would largely disappear. As matters stand, it offers an ambiguous assurance to all Faculty without tenure that if they "have performed satisfactorily", they "*will* be reappointed" (our emphasis). This promise, or prediction, is further supported by the assurance that "satisfactory performance will be based on teaching, scholarly interests and other contributions to the University and will be judged by appropriate faculty committees subject to the approval of the Board of Governors."

34. We think that if the contract renewal procedure is retained because short-term contracts are not abolished, the University will continue to have difficulties. University teachers are, by nature, highly intelligent and sometimes given to anxiety. Moreover, they are, especially those in the social sciences and the humanities, controversialists. Controversy is their stock-in-trade. If they are to enjoy academic freedom they must not live in fear of the reaction of their Department Head to their contrary views. Yet as long as their appointment is subject to review they are in a state of dependency. Heads of Departments and Deans, as well as Presidents and Boards of Governors, are human and susceptible to the universal temptation to resist those who disagree with us. To establish a procedure that caters to this human weakness is to invite frequent disputes, masquerading under some false front, pretending to be disputes about teaching, scholarly interests, or contributions to the University. The present rules do not permit the assertion of such honest grounds for non-renewal as that the candidate is incompatible to the extent that his colleagues cannot work while he is around. Nor do they guarantee that his colleagues will be consulted in the question. Whether or not short-term appointments are persisted in, the "appropriate faculty committees" should be named so as to include a majority of representatives from the candidate's discipline, and they should be elected by the candidate's department, by secret ballot if necessary.

35. It should also be made clear that the appointment of academic staff is an academic responsibility. If the university committee recommends against an appointment, the President should not recommend the appointment to the Board of Governors, who cannot, under the *Universities Act*, make any appointment without the President's personal recommendation. If, on the other hand, the committee recommends an appointment the President has some reason for refusing to take to the Board with his unequivocal support, he should frankly state his position

to the committee and not refer the matter to the Board. Any less respect by the President for the judgment of the committee is likely to leave the committee with a distinct feeling that it has been wasting its time. At Simon Fraser University we got the impression that most Faculty members were far too busy at important University duties to waste any time on committees whose advice was ignored.

(b) Procedure on the reappointment of Professor Kenneth Burstein

36. While we were at Simon Fraser the Board met to consider, among other matters, the President's recommendation for the reappointment for two years of Kenneth Burstein, who has been an Assistant Professor of Psychology for the past two years. The matter had been the subject of some discussion over a period of several months. It may be relevant to observe that Professor Burstein, along with others of his colleagues, had opposed the appointment of the Head of his Department (a matter we discuss below). When Professor Burstein's contract came up for consideration, his Head informed him that he would not be recommended for renewal. Professor Burstein "appealed" to the Faculty of Arts Salary and Promotions Committee and, in turn, to the University Committee on Salaries and Promotions. That Committee first decided that Professor Burstein be reappointed for one year. This reappointment, although for only one year, was not described as "terminal" and may have been thought of as carrying a slight rebuke or reprimand.

37. In any case, Professor Burstein "appealed" again, in accordance with the procedures defined by the President in his official memorandum to "All Faculty" on 25 October 1967. The memorandum stated, "It should be emphasized that an individual faculty member can appeal decisions taken at any step in this procedure and, indeed, can appeal directly to me after the final recommendation of the University Salary and Promotions Committee". Professor Burstein's "appeal" to Dr. McTaggart-Cowan evidently resulted in the appointment of three members of the University Committee as a "special committee" to consider the matter once more. On 22 December 1967 the President informed Professor Burstein in writing that the Committee had reported its recommendation "that Dr. Burstein receive a normal two-year appointment". The President went on to say, "This has been accepted by the University Committee on Salaries and Promotions and I will be taking it to the Board of Governors at their next meeting".

38. Professor Burstein was presumably put at his ease just before Christmas with this assurance from the President, but at the next Board

meeting, on 18 January, the Board found that the Special Committee was not provided for in the Faculty Handbook and was therefore invalid. Instead, the Board arbitrarily accepted the recommendation of the Faculty of Arts Committee, which was also the original recommendation of the University Committee, for a one-year reappointment.

39. This example of inept administration, which, as it were, took place before our eyes, typifies the kind of procedure that we heard complained of so frequently by Faculty members and by the Executive of the Faculty Association. It represents not only a complete disregard by the Board for the recommendation of its President, but also a retroactive denial of an official procedure established by the President. The President was presumably acting on behalf of the Board, and in any event he was clearly acting within his responsibility to satisfy himself that he was taking to the Board the proper recommendation respecting Professor Burstein's appointment. The Board apparently overruled the President's promised recommendation, and we have no evidence that he changed it or had any acceptable reason for changing it. We cannot understand why the action taken by the Board was more acceptable to the President than it has been to the Faculty Association Executive. The demoralizing effect of these actions was immediately apparent to us when we talked with Professor Burstein, the Executive of the Faculty Association and other Faculty members on the day after the Board met.

40. As for the Board's argument for refusing to accept the President's recommendation, we think two observations are pertinent. First, the "appeal" to which the Board took objection was a matter wholly within the University Committee's recommendation, inasmuch as the recommendation of the Special Committee appointed by the President to advise him on Professor Burstein's appeal was in turn referred back to the University Committee and "accepted" by them. The President, therefore, had every justification to tell the Board that his recommendation was supported by the University Committee provided for in the Handbook. The "appeal" was in reality only a review and reconsideration by the Committee.

41. Second, the provision for "appeal", although not in the Handbook, was promulgated by the President. If the Faculty cannot rely on the President, acting within his apparent authority, to represent the Board of Governors, particularly in respect of internal procedures, the Faculty are certain to suffer acute frustration. The Board had no good reason

to disapprove of the President's appeal procedures since the "appeal" was referred back, though concern might have been felt about an "appeal" to three of the members of the Committee if there had been no reference back. In such a case the Board might well have advised the President to change the rules respecting appeal to suit the Board's taste. To have made this change retroactively to apply to Professor Burstein, who had resorted to the procedure in good faith, seems to us quite indefensible.

(c) Procedure on the appointment of the Head of the Department of Psychology

42. The method of appointment of Dr. Bernard E. Lyman, Acting Head of Psychology, as Head was cited to us as the prime example of the frustrations suffered by the Faculty. We inquired into the matter at some length, interviewing the President, the former Head of the Department, the new Head, and most of the members of the Department, both senior and junior. Despite our careful attention to all these participants in the appointment, and to the versions offered by some members of the President's Committee to advise on the appointment, we are still unable to say with confidence precisely what happened. The situation was, in our view, poetically and aptly described by one member of the Department as a "Byzantine schamozzle".

43. It would appear that at the start of the affair the President established a university committee to advise him, and the committee received names from the Department. It considered them, but rejected all but one, who was invited to take the post and refused. One thing seems clear: the President's committee finally advised the President not to appoint a Head at this time (Spring, 1967) but to appoint a Chairman for a year and let the committee continue with the search. Whether this was a majority decision or a unanimous decision is disputed, but there is general agreement that the Committee did so advise.

44. The President's almost immediate response was to appoint the Acting Head to the permanent post. Whether the Acting Head was unanimously rejected as a candidate is still not clear to us, but it seems quite certain that he was rejected by well over half the department, including at least some of the senior members.

45. In one most important respect we remain in the dark as to the "facts". Professor Lyman was quite confident that the arrangement he had made from the start with the President was that if no new Head

had been appointed by 1 December 1966, he would himself automatically be appointed. He was equally confident that every member of the Department knew this from the beginning. While views expressed by the Department members with whom we spoke varied considerably, no view fully coincided with Professor Lyman's. Most of the views were opposed to his to some degree, and some were flatly opposite. The only evidence that does not depend on someone's memory is the President's memos of 16 December 1966 and 3 January 1967. His language there is consistent with his recollection that Professor Lyman would be considered if no one else turned up by 1 December. In fact the time was extended, with Professor Lyman's consent, but there is no suggestion that any new arrangement as to his appointment was made at the time of the extension.

46. The explanation offered for the rejection of the University Committee's recommendation that a chairman be appointed for one year at least and the search continued is that there was no one competent to chair the Department who was also willing. We gather that no Assistant Professor was offered the post. While the Assistant Professors are admittedly young and inexperienced, we have little doubt that several of them were capable of the task, if the task were properly understood. We think there may have been something of a misconception of the rôle of a departmental chairman under normal circumstances and especially in the unusual circumstances here. Our attention was drawn to the fact that the Philosophy Department had rotated its Chairmen from the beginning, but it was explained that this was a small Department and the same happy results could not be expected from the Department of Psychology. We think it unlikely that under a young and inexperienced Chairman a year, or even two years, would pass without some troubles, but we doubt that they would have been worse than the troubles experienced with the present Head. We feel constrained to urge Simon Fraser University to reflect again about its departmental structure. The Duff/Berdahl recommendations, reached after a very thorough study of university government, cannot easily be set aside.

47. Once again the Faculty members who reported on this matter felt confident that the President received the communication — there was no failure. The complaint is that the President had wasted the committee members' time. Their advice was flouted. There seems to have been no serious attack on the committee's composition. Some queries were made about the procedure for selecting representatives from the Faculty of Arts. Because of changes in the Deanship at a crucial

point, the nominees were not ratified as had been expected, but no one proposed to us that the committee ought to have been disqualified. The procedures could certainly have been improved, and we are satisfied that they will be, but the real point remains — what status does a committee have?

48. We are moved to remark, at this point, that Simon Fraser's early strength may be its current weakness. At the beginning, power was necessarily concentrated in the President and Heads of Departments. But today it is inconceivable that a President can run a university of 7,000 students, off and on campus, with a Faculty of 315, with only himself at the top and with so-called strong Heads of Departments under him. It is not enough that there be, as is planned, an Academic Vice-President, and fulltime Deans. It should be a first responsibility of the Faculty Association to urge on the Administration, as we do here and now, that the Vice-President (Academic) and the new Deans be given real authority. Unless there is a real delegation of authority at the top, the President is likely to be increasingly confronted with claims of maladministration of the sort involved in the appointments we have just discussed.

(d) Procedure on promulgation of the Report on Administrative Reorganization

49. A recent report on administrative reorganization announced several radical changes in the administration of the University. The report was circulated to "All Faculty" by the President on 6 November 1967. The President's "memo" announced that the recommendations had been approved by the Board. The Faculty Association contend that they had no opportunity to make representations before the ad hoc committee appointed to study the matter, which reported to the Committee of Heads prior to being presented to the Board of Governors. Dean McKinnon, of the Faculty of Education, who was chairman of the ad hoc committee, was confident that all the Heads of Departments knew about the committee and had ample opportunity to make representations, but he could not speak for the Department Heads as to the trickle down of their knowledge and opportunity.

50. This affair seems to us to be one of the few genuine "failures of communication" that we heard about. Certainly the Faculty Association had a most vital concern about the subject and could have made very substantial recommendations. It could have pressed for consideration of the Duff/Berdahl Report, now two years old, whose recommenda-

tions had been in current discussions for the preceding two years. Apparently no consideration was given to the establishment of limited terms for administrators, or to election of administrators by the Departments or Faculties.

51. It is worth reporting that we were given a copy of a memorandum to the Chairman of the Senate from the Dean of Arts, dated 20 November 1967, some two weeks after the President's announcement of the Board's approval of the reorganization recommendations. The Dean's memorandum reports on a meeting of the Faculty of Arts on Thursday, 16 November, that discussed the President's memorandum of 6 November. The Dean said, "Faculty opinion on various points was obtained and was taken note of by those members of Senate from the Faculty of Arts who attended the meeting". The matters reported have regard to the appointments of an Academic Vice-President and Deans. Both specific recommendations have to do with "self-determination" by the Faculties. We are surprised that such basic matters should have been coming up for discussion by the Faculty, after the President's memorandum, apparently for the first time.

(e) The check-off of Faculty Association Dues

52. On another matter we discovered a second instance of "failure of communication", this time reaching into a sensitive area for the Faculty Association. According to the Association's version, the President agreed to a system of check-off for the collection of dues from members of the Faculty Association; the system was to be an "opt-out" system in which every potential member on the Campus would have his salary docked unless he gave notice that he did not wish to be a member. The burden of opting-out would be on the Faculty member. According to the President's version, the agreement was that he would install the check-off, but would have to consult the Bursar about opting-out.

53. The Bursar's position was, apparently, that it would be illegal to dock salaries without express advance authority from the individual Faculty member. We do not argue that point. We have been given to understand, however, that the only illegality is in the first withholding of the dues of the Faculty member who has failed to notify the Bursar that he opts-out. His notification would come promptly as a complaint, and of course would be an opting-out. If the Bursar then reimbursed him for the docked dues, the Faculty member would have no substantial

claim against the University. We can hardly help wondering how such a procedure, which has been adopted at various universities in Canada, could seriously upset even the unsettled Faculty of Simon Fraser University.

54. In any event, the Faculty Association came away with the view that the President simply reversed himself after talking with the Bursar and left it to the Association to learn on the next pay day that no dues had been withheld. The President thought he had notified the Association President immediately after talking to the Bursar, having already cautioned the Association President that he could not agree on this point during their first interview.

55. The settlement of this dispute over the facts is not important. There was, in our view, undoubtedly a failure of communication. It points up the advisability of confirming oral decisions with a written record. A short but precise record, stating one understanding of the agreement reached and requesting a correction if one is necessary, should be adequate. There is no need for an overly sensitive reaction of suspicion or distrust. Human memories are far from perfect, and communication sometimes does fail, though hardly, we think, as frequently as the overuse of the cliché would suggest.

56. The significance of this failure of the University administration to "chance" the law and accommodate the Faculty Association probably loomed larger in the Faculty Association's eyes than in the President's. At the time of the suggestion the Union was campaigning for members. The reliance of the Faculty Association on what they believed to be the assurance of Administration that the opt-out check-off system would be installed led the Association to campaign in low key when it should have been working hardest. When the Association Executive resigned in October, the paid-up membership was about 240. At the end of the year there were only about 120 members, and this loss could not be more than half accounted for by the Union membership of 50 or 60. We know that there was some duplication of membership.

57. It seems clear that the unfortunate events of October weakened the Faculty Association on the Campus. No one can take any satisfaction from this state of affairs. From our discussions with the Union representatives we concluded that the Union would be quite happy with a strong and effective Faculty Association. They claimed to be interested only in forcing action. Despite the fact that both the retiring Executive of the Faculty Association and the new Executive invited this Committee

to the Campus, these Union representatives claimed credit for our presence. At least we felt doubly or triply welcome. We were also welcomed by President McTaggart-Cowan, who said, in his letter,

> "I am a strong advocate of a well-developed Faculty Association as an essential component on a university campus, and even though as far as our Act is concerned it is outside the corporate structure of the University, I look upon the Faculty Association as an essential component of the University community in total. I look forward to a steady strengthening of the links between the administration and the Association on a broad basis, covering all areas of common interest."

58. We agree with the President that a well-developed Faculty Association is essential, but we do not share any possible concern he may have that it is "outside the corporate structure of the University". It is rightly outside the corporate structure and we sincerely hope that it will remain so. We look upon the Faculty Association as playing the rôle of ombudsman, keeping its eye on government within the corporate structure, ever alert to see that academic freedom is maintained in this "place of liberty", and pressing constantly for the highest and best that is attainable in the university community.

59. If it is to serve this function effectively, the Faculty Association must be able to provide a forum in which its members may discuss with the greatest candour any matter that they may feel to affect the well-being of the University. It is a fact of common experience that the presence of the very senior administrators of a university, especially that of the president, will inhibit discussion and reduce the effectiveness of the faculty association as a forum, not to say a safety-valve. For this reason many faculty associations do not extend membership to such officers as the university president and vice-presidents. Where they do so, it is common practice, and in our judgement wise, for such persons to absent themselves from association meetings, except when they are especially invited to attend. It is our opinion that membership in the Faculty Association ought not to be extended to such officers or to the Chancellor.

(f) Faculty Association representation on University Committees

60. The rôle of the Faculty Association is brought directly into consideration by the contention of the Executive that the President has not always appointed a Faculty Association representative on University committees. We were told that representatives had been

appointed to two Committees, on Pensions and on Food Services. The President thought that there were representatives on more of the Committees, but we didn't ask him or the Association to check. We question whether this involvement does not put the Faculty Association at some disadvantage, since its principal rôle, in any matter on which there is a University Committee, is to appear in support of its policies as they affect the matter before the Committee. To have a member on the Committee, which, if it is properly constituted, has adequate representation of the Faculty anyway, is likely to be as much an embarrassment as a help.

61. Our concern in this matter is rather that the University itself is not as well organized as it might be to insure that individual Faculty members play effectively their appropriate role in matters that seriously affect them. The University community is not to be compared with a business corporation, much though some administrators may be tempted to the comparison. A university is not a business, a government or an army. It is a democratic community. The notion that all power should be concentrated at the top simply won't work. Fifty years ago it might have done so, but ideas of community and democracy have changed in that interval; a failure to meet this change fairly and squarely will only prolong and intensify unrest.

62. We felt a high degree of confidence, in our discussions with the Union representatives, with the Teaching Assistants and with the students, that they wanted, not merely recognition, but a genuine sense of participation in the community matters that so seriously affect them. We could not dispute the justice of this desire. The C.A.U.T. has long advocated the strengthening of democracy in university life. We believe that in the older and perhaps more conservative universities this ideal is being achieved, and achieved in a more effective way than at Simon Fraser University, despite that University's announced goals and the President's expressed sympathy with the ambitions of the Faculty Association.

63. Part of the explanation for the overlap of Faculty and Faculty Association interests may be found in the inadequacy of the Senate, which, like most senates in Canadian universities, is a mixed body of academic and lay members. There may be an unrecognized need at Simon Fraser University for a wholly academic body that includes all Faculty members and has a real responsibility for the development of academic interests affecting the whole University. The only occasion now for assembling the whole Faculty is in a joint meeting of Faculties,

which is provided for, incidentally, in one or two minor places in the Universities Act. There now exists no establishment, no statement of jurisdiction, beyond the two instances in the Act, and no machinery for regular meetings and the appointment of committees. The present practice, by which so large a number of committees are chosen by the President and frequently chaired by him is unwise. Inevitably it results in reports going to the President, who may or may not give them full circulation to the general Faculty, or a suitable opportunity for them to be discussed by the Faculty. It may be very helpful to have an academic body available and organized, in advance of crisis situations. The organization of such a body should provide for committees responsible to it.

64. It may be objected that there would be very few Faculty members who would bother to attend meetings. Certainly as the size increases this would likely happen. This anticipation of poor attendance is not a reason for not establishing a forum. It may be more important to find a smaller place that cannot hold all the Faculty, but lends itself more effectively to good debate and discussion. If the crowd overflows, the meeting can always retire to the Academic Quad for an open air gathering on the first fine day. Meanwhile, in the smaller room effective discussion can continue and smaller committees can be established. A University as committed to the interdisciplinary approach as is Simon Fraser might explore this notion more carefully. We understand that it works effectively at the University of Saskatchewan.

E. *Conclusions and Recommendations*

65. We have concluded that there is a serious "failure of communication" at Simon Fraser University in the sense that there is strong dissatisfaction with the response of the President to communications, especially communications from various committees, received and understood by him. We think this dissatisfaction has its origin in the concept of administration at Simon Fraser, which, in a general way, is adversely affected throughout by absentee management and an undemocratic distribution of power along uncertain lines. We cannot stress strongly enough that a university is a largely self-governing community of scholars. While for many purposes it is essential to have individual academic administrators rather than committees, it is preferable that the administrators be responsible to the Faculty members, whether as a committee, a Department, or a Faculty, rather than in some vague way to the Board of Governors, independently of the Faculty members.

66. While we think that the dissatisfaction of Faculty members is well founded, we feel that their complaints can be remedied by more forthright administration, with a redirection of responsibility, especially as the University increases in size and experience, and by a greater sense of give and take in some Faculty members. We were generally impressed by the reasonableness of the Faculty members, and we could not conclude that their behaviour was irresponsible. In some cases, we felt that the most inexperienced teachers simply haven't been around universities long enough yet to know what to expect, even in the most liberal of democratic university communities. No community of humans will ever be as harmonious as a community of angels.

(a) *The relations of the President to the Board of Governors*

67. We *recommend* that the Faculty Association press upon the President and the Board the urgency of the need for redirection of responsibility for decisions within the University. Those matters of academic judgment, of which appointments and promotions are prime examples, should be determined by the Faculty acting through established democratic procedures, subject only to a veto power in the Board. The President must recommend an appointment or promotion before the Board has any jurisdiction. The Board should be able to question the recommendation only if it challenges the President's integrity or capacity to apply fair procedures. Otherwise it should approve the appointment unless it has information not available to the President, which it should reveal and then ask the President to reconsider the matter.

(b) *Faculty meetings with the Board of Governors*

68. Unless and until there are at least three members of the Board elected by the Faculty from the Faculty, we *recommend* that there be established regular meetings of the Board, the President, the Faculty Association and representatives from the Faculty elected by a joint meeting of the Faculties.

(c) *Short term appointments for all academic administrators*

69. It is clear that there is undue emphasis on Department Heads at the expense of Deans, which may be in the process of being corrected. Clearly also there is undue emphasis on Heads and Deans, as well as the President, at the expense of Departmental and Faculty members. We *recommend* that the Duff/Berdahl recommendations respecting short terms of office for academic administrative staff be carefully

considered by Simon Fraser University, from the Board of Governors all the way to the Faculty Association. The more democratic principles of organization advocated by Duff/Berdahl have already been adopted in some universities, and current pressures from both faculty and students make their adoption everywhere only a matter of time. With a short term appointment by a democratic process there automatically comes "tenure" for that short term, thus guaranteeing a department and faculty greater independence. Although the Duff/Berdahl Report does not recommend a short term for a president, we should ourselves unhesitatingly recommend it for the same reasons that Duff/Berdahl recommend it for other administrators. If a president holds office for a short term, and even more so if he is democratically appointed for that term, he may find much easier the difficult task of representing the faculty to, and at times *against,* the board of governors.

(d) *The establishment of an exclusively academic body with substantial powers*

70. We *recommend* that the University consider the establishment of an exclusively academic body representative of the whole Faculty. Whether this is better done by redesigning the Senate to make it both exclusively academic and more representative, or by establishing a formal structure for joint meetings of Faculties, with specific powers of decision and recommendation, we need not decide here. The present confusion between the Faculty and the Faculty Association seems to us to betray the need for better Faculty representation on many matters.

(e) *Adoption of an appointment and tenure policy along C.A.U.T. Guidelines*

71. We strongly *recommend* that renewable contracts be minimised or discontinued completely and that the University adopt forthwith a tenure programme along the lines of the C.A.U.T. Policy Statement.

72. We do not feel that we can recommend specific remedial action in respect of those specific issues on which we have commented above. We did not proceed as judges and we are not in a position to judge, condemn or sentence. We do think, however, that these matters would bear review in a meeting with those Faculty members individually affected, the Faculty Association and the President, so that each has a chance to clarify his point of view to the others. We think the essential solution is the delegation of authority in clear fashion to

various democratically establishment committees within the University community.

73. In conclusion, we want to state emphatically our confidence that the unhappy situation at Simon Fraser University can be satisfactorily settled without resignations or dismissals within the University. Hasty withdrawal or removal at this stage could only add to the bitterness and create conditions in which suitable replacement would be virtually impossible. What is needed is a clear understanding of the responsibility for the formation, direction, and administration of academic policy. The Board of Governors must see its modest role in a new light. The President and Faculty must share responsibility for all aspects of academic policy, including its administration. They must be ready to advise the Board on all other matters respecting the well-being of the University community. Individual Faculty members must acknowledge decisions taken by democratically appointed academic administrators acting alone or on the advice of committees. The Faculty Association must stand firm in its insistence that this clear understanding be reached — and soon. Simon Fraser University is too important to the future of British Columbia for any lesser compromise to be acceptable.

J. B. Milner, Chairman
Alwyn Berland
J. Percy Smith

CONSEIL DES ARTS DU CANADA : HUMANITÉS ET SCIENCES SOCIALES

1966-1967

Une loi fédérale de mars mille neuf cent cinquante-sept établit le Conseil des Arts du Canada. Au cours du premier exercice, les recettes du Conseil se chiffrent à quelque deux millions de dollars, les dépenses à environ un million et demi. Six ans plus tard, soit en 1962-1963, les recettes atteignent quelque trois millions de dollars. Entre 1964-1965 et 1965-1966, les dépenses passent de 3.3 millions à 6.9 millions, soit une augmentation de 107.0 pour cent. En 1966-1967, les dépenses dépassent 10 millions de dollars.

Le tableau 1 indique la distribution procentuelle des subventions du Conseil des Arts selon le domaine au cours des trois derniers exercices. Les subventions aux arts représentent 44.9 pour cent des dépenses en 1964-1965, 49.8 pour cent en 1965-1966 et 40.3 pour cent en 1966-1967. Les subventions aux humanités et aux sciences sociales comptent pour 51.7 pour cent en 1966-1967, augmentation procentuelle par rapport à 1964-1965. Les frais d'administration qui se chiffrent à 416 mille dollars en 1964-1965 diminuent relativement à l'augmentation du montant des subventions. Ils atteignent 12.5 pour cent des dépenses totales en 1964-1965 par rapport à 6.4 pour cent en 1966-1967.

tableau 1 *CONSEIL DES ARTS DU CANADA: selon le secteur, dépenses totales et distribution procentuelle des déboursés, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967*

secteur	1964-1965		1965-1966		1966-1967	
	$'000	%	$'000	%	$'000	%
arts	1 500	44.9	3 441	49.8	4 352	40.3
humanités et sciences sociales	1 334	40.0	2 856	41.3	5 581	51.7
Unesco	88	2.6	135	2.0	167	1.6
administration	416	12.5	479	6.9	690	6.4
t o t a l	*3 338*	*100.0*	*6 911*	*100.0*	*10 790*	*100.0*

Les dépenses du Conseil (tableau 2) augmentent de 107.0 pour cent

entre 1964-1965 et 1965-1966 en regard d'une augmentation de 56.1

tableau 2 *CONSEIL DES ARTS DU CANADA: selon le secteur, augmentation procentuelle des dépenses entre 1964-1965 et 1965-1966, entre 1965-1966 et 1966-1967, et hausse annuelle moyenne des déboursés entre 1964-1965 et 1966-1967*

secteur	augmentation entre 1964-65 et 1965-66	augmentation entre 1965-66 et 1966-67	augmentation annuelle moyenne entre 1964-65 et 1966-67
	%	%	%
arts	129.4	26.5	95.1
humanités et sciences sociales	114.1	95.4	159.2
Unesco	53.4	23.7	44.9
administration	15.1	44.1	32.9
t o t a l	*107.0*	*56.1*	*111.6*

pour cent entre 1965-1966 et 1966-1967. Depuis 1964-1965, les humanités et les sciences sociales reçoivent une aide accrue de l'ordre d'une

tableau 3 *CONSEIL DES ARTS DU CANADA: nombre de bourses de doctorat, de bourses de perfectionnement, de subventions de recherche entre 1964-1965 et 1966-1967; augmentation procentuelle du nombre entre 1964-1965 et 1965-1966, entre 1965-1966 et 1966-1967, et hausse annuelle moyenne du nombre entre 1964-1965 et 1966-1967*

s e c t e u r	n o	augmentation entre 1964-65 et 1965-66	augmentation entre 1965-66 et 1966-67	augmentation annuelle moyenne entre 1964-65 et 1966-67
		%	%	%
bourses de doctorat				
1964-1965	286	-	-	
1965-1966	519	81.5	-	
1966-1967	940	228.7	81.1	114.4
bourses de perfectionnement				
1964-1965	40	-	-	
1965-1966	42	5.0	-	
1966-1967	103	157.5	145.2	78.8
subventions de recherche de moins de $5 000				
1965-1966	21	-	-	
1966-1967	111	-	428.6	-
subventions de recherche de plus de $5 000				
1965-1966	18	-	-	
1966-1967	36	-	100.00	-

hausse annuelle moyenne de 159.2 pour cent. Dans le domaine des arts, l'augmentation annuelle moyenne des subventions se situe à 95.1 pour cent. Durant cette période, les dépenses totales s'accroissent en moyenne annuellement de 111.6 pour cent, les frais d'administration de 32.9 pour cent.

Le programme d'aide du Conseil aux humanités et aux sciences sociales comporte l'octroi de bourses de doctorat et de perfectionnement, l'octroi de subventions aux travaux de recherche, à la publication et aux collections de recherche des bibliothèques. Le Conseil défraye aussi une partie du coût lors de congrès et de conférences et subventionne un programme d'échange de professeurs avec les pays francophones.

Entre 1964-1965 et 1966-1967 (tableau 3), le nombre de bourses de doctorat passe de 286 à 940 soit une hausse annuelle moyenne de 114.4 pour cent. Les bourses de perfectionnement atteignent le nombre de 103 en 1966-1967 par rapport à 40 deux années plus tôt, soit une augmentation annuelle moyenne de 78.8 pour cent. Le programme

tableau 4 *CONSEIL DES ARTS DU CANADA: montant des subventions à la publication, aux collections de recherche des bibliothèques et aux travaux de recherche de plus de $ 5 000; augmentation procentuelle entre 1964-1965 et 1965-1966, entre 1965-1966 et 1966-1967; subvention moyenne selon l'exercice et le secteur*

secteur	montant des subventions	augmentation entre 1964-65 et 1965-66	augmentation entre 1965-66 et 1966-67	subvention moyenne
	$ (no)	%	%	$
publication				
1964-1965	84 940 (16)	-	-	5 309
1965-1966	136 418 (27)	60.6	-	5 053
1966-1967	297 360 (27)	250.1	118.0	11 013
collections de recherche des bibliothèques				
1964-1965	51 750 (22)	-	-	2 352
1965-1966	565 100 (27)	992.0	-	20 930
1966-1967	492 000 (26)	850.7	-12.9	18 923
subventions de recherche de plus de $ 5 000				
1965-1966	228 250 (18)	-	-	12 681
1966-1967	510 387 (36)	-	123.6	14 177

de subvention aux travaux de recherche débute en 1965-1966 [1]. La première année, 39 subventions sont offertes; 18 d'entre elles ont une valeur de plus de $5 000 chacune. Le nombre de 111 subventions de moins de $5 000 en 1966-1967 représente une augmentation de plus de 400 pour cent sur l'année précédente. Le nombre de subventions de plus de $5 000 atteint 36 en 1966-1967.

Le tableau 4 indique les montants versés par le Conseil sous forme de subvention aux publications, aux collections de recherche des bibliothèques et à la recherche. En plus d'une augmentation dans le montant total des sommes versées, la valeur moyenne de chacune des subventions s'accroît également.

Suivent cet article, des relevés statistiques sur les subventions du Conseil des Arts du Canada durant l'exercice 1966-1967 [2] dans le domaine des humanités et des sciences sociales.

Mireille Lapointe
chargé de recherches

---

[1] excl. le programme de subvention de la recherche à court terme, abandonné en 1966-1967.
[2] Les tableaux statistiques des exercices 1964-1965 et 1965-1966 sont publiés dans le *Bulletin de l'A.C.P.U.*, tome 15, n° 4, pp. 49-55.

tableau 5

CONSEIL DES ARTS DU CANADA: bourses de doctorat selon la discipline, 1965-1966° et 1966-1967

discipline	1965-1966	1966-1967
	no	no
anthropologie	16	39 (5)*
architecture	2	3
administration	5	10
criminologie	2	2
droit	4	17
économique	58 (4)*	114 (14)*
education	9	-
études classiques	13	22 (2)*
géographie	21 (4)*	32
histoire	96 (7)*	164 (9)*
lettres	134 (8)*	226 (11)*
linguistique	9	43 (3)*
mathématiques-statistiques	6	6 (1)*
musique	13	15 (2)*
philosophie	40 (1)*	88 (1)*
psychologie	29 (1)*	29 (2)*
relations industrielles	3	-
sciences politiques	44	97 (4)*
sociologie	36 (2)*	88 (10)*
autres	6	11 (2)*
total	546	1 006
* refusées	27	66
T O T A L	519	940

° depuis la publication du rapport 1965-1966, le Conseil des Arts du Canada a décerné 71 nouvelles bourses de doctorat au cours de cet exercice. Nous ajoutons donc ces bourses à celles annoncées dans le rapport de 1965-1966.

tableau 6

CONSEIL DES ARTS DU CANADA: nombre et montant des subventions selon l'université: subventions aux bibliothèques et subventions de recherche de $ 5 000 et plus 1966-1967

université	Subventions aux bibliothèques		Subventions de recherche	
	$	no	$	no
Alberta	44 000	(1)	7 625	(1)
U.B.C.	-	-	40 125	(3)
Calgary	8 000	(1)	5 700	(1)
Carleton	18 000	(1)	-	-
Dalhousie	20 000	(1)	-	-
Guelph	5 000	(1)	5 500	(1)
Laval	34 000	(1)	25 700	(1)
Loyola	3 000	(1)	-	-
Manitoba	22 000	(1)	11 160	(1)
McGill	39 000	(1)	46 182	(4)
McMaster	19 000	(1)	-	-
Montréal	37 000	(1)	82 965	(4½*)
U. N. B.	20 000	(1)	-	-
Ottawa	20 000	(1)	-	-
Queen's	33 000	(1)	14 000	(1)
St-Paul (Ottawa)	6 000	(1)	-	-
Saskatchewan	21 000	(1)	-	-
Sherbrooke	-	-	22 500	(1)
Simon Fraser	8 000	(1)	-	-
Sir G. Williams	2 000	(1)	9 100	(1)
Toronto	80 000	(3)	122 650	(7½*)
Victoria	5 000	(1)	14 000	(2)
Waterloo	9 000	(1)	20 500	(3)
Western	27 000	(1)	74 380	(3)
Windsor	7 000	(1)	-	-
Autres	5 000	(1)	8 300	(1)
T O T A L	492 000	(26)	510 387	(36)

* Subvention de $ 16 300 pour un travail conjoint: Montréal et Toronto. Nous avons calculé respectivement ½ subvention de $ 8 150 à Montréal et à Toronto.

tableau 7

CONSEIL DES ARTS DU CANADA: bourses de perfectionnement

selon l'université et la discipline, 1966-1967

université	Anthropologie	Architecture	Droit	Economique	Etudes classiques	Géographie	Histoire	Lettres	Linguistique	Mathématiques statistiques	Philosophie	Psychologie	Sciences politiques	Sociologie	Autres	TOTAL
	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
Alberta	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
U. B. C.	1	-	-	2 (2)*	1	1	2	4	1	1	3	-	3	1	-	20 (2)*
Calgary	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Carleton	-	-	-	1	-	-	1 (1)*	3	-	-	-	-	2	2 (1)*	-	9 (2)*
Dalhousie	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Laval	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1 (1)*	-	-	-	1	-	-	3 (1)*
Loyola	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Manitoba	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
McGill	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2
McMaster	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2
Montréal	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	2	2	1	-	-	8
U. N. B.	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Ottawa	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	5
Queen's	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	3
R. M. C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
St. Dunstan's	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1

tableau 7
(suite)

CONSEIL DES ARTS DU CANADA: bourses de perfectionnement

selon l'université et la discipline, 1966-1967

université	Anthropologie	Architecture	Droit	Economique	Etudes classiques	Géographie	Histoire	Lettres	Linguistique	Mathématiques statistiques	Philosophie	Psychologie	Sciences politiques	Sociologie	Autres	TOTAL
	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
St Francis X.	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2
Saskatchewan	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2
Simon Fraser	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Sir G. Williams	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Toronto	-	-	-	1	2	-	2	6	2	-	-	-	1 (1)*	1	1	16 (1)*
Trent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Waterloo	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Western	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Windsor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	3
Winnipeg	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
York	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	3
Autres	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	2
total	2	1	1	10	7	3	16	26	7	2	9	3	13	7	2	109
refusées	-	-	-	*2*	-	-	*1*	-	*1*	-	-	-	*1*	*1*	-	*6*
TOTAL	2	1	1	8	7	3	15	26	6	2	9	3	12	6	2	103

tableau 8

CONSEIL DES ARTS DU CANADA: subventions de recherche de moins de $ 5 000

selon l'université et la discipline, 1966-1967

université	Anthropologie	Droit	Economique	Etudes classiques	Géographie	Histoire	Lettres	Linguistique	Mathématiques statistiques	Musique	Philosophie	Psychologie	Relations industrielles	Sciences politiques	Sociologie	Autres	TOTAL
	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
Bishop's	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
U. B. C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	5
Calgary	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	6
Carleton	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	4
Guelph	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
Laval	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	4
Loyola	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Manitoba	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	5
McGill	-	1	-	-	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
McMaster	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3
Memorial	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Montréal	-	-	-	2	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	7
U. N. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Ottawa	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3
Queen's	-	-	-	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	6

tableau 8
(suite)

CONSEIL DES ARTS DU CANADA: subventions de recherche de moins de $ 5 000
selon l'université et la discipline, 1966-1967

université	Anthropologie	Droit	Economique	Etudes classiques	Géographie	Histoire	Lettres	Linguistique	Mathématiques statistiques	Musique	Philosophie	Psychologie	Relations industrielles	Sciences politiques	Sociologie	Autres	TOTAL
	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
St. Francis X.	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
Saskatchewan	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3
Sherbrooke	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
Simon Fraser	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2
Sir G. Williams	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	4
Toronto	-	-	-	1	-	5	3	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11
Trent	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	5
Victoria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Waterloo	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	8
Western	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	3
Windsor	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Winnipeg	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
York	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	7
Autres	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
TOTAL	3	4	4	7	7	23	30	3	1	1	2	2	1	9	10	4	111

SUBVENTIONS DU CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES

1964-1965, 1965-1966, 1966-1967

L'exercice 1966-1967 marque la cinquantième année du programme d'aide à la recherche du Conseil national de recherches. Depuis 1957-1958, les dépenses annuelles du Conseil sous forme d'aide aux chercheurs, aux étudiants et aux universités passent de 3.1 millions de dollars à 11 millions et demi en 1962-1963, à 23.9 millions en 1965-1966 et à 36.9 millions en 1966-1967, soit une augmentation annuelle moyenne de 121.1 pour cent entre 1957-1958 et 1966-1967.

En 1965, la Commission Bladen sur le financement de l'enseignement supérieur formulait au gouvernement fédéral la recommandation suivante :

> « Que la responsabilité fédérale de financer la recherche soit reconnue par une augmentation considérable des subventions de recherche accordées aux universités, aux membres de leur personnel et à leurs étudiants engagés dans la recherche. Nous recommandons particulièrement :
>
> que les crédits dont dispose le Conseil national de recherches pour subventionner la recherche dans les universités y inclus les suppléments dont il est question ci-dessous soient portés à $40 millions pour l'année 1966-1967, et soient ensuite majorés de 20 pour cent annuellement;
>
> . . . que toutes les subventions de recherche du Gouvernement fédéral aux universités (par le Conseil national de recherches, le Conseil de la recherche médicale, le Conseil des Arts du Canada, la Commission de la recherche pour la Défense, l'Aide extérieure, la Commission de l'Énergie atomique, les ministères des Pêcheries, des Mines, etc.) pour les frais de fonctionnement et toutes les bourses pour les étudiants gradués soient accompagnées d'un supplément de 30 pour cent à titre de subvention inconditionnée à l'université;
>
> qu'une subvention générale d'aide à la recherche soit versée à chaque université ayant droit aux subventions per capita mentionnées ci-dessous; que cette subvention s'élève à 10

pour cent du total des traitements du personnel universitaire travaillant à plein temps [1]. »

La Commission explique en ces termes les raisons qui la portent à demander l'addition de suppléments au programme actuel de subventions et de bourses et à recommander le versement d'une subvention générale d'aide à la recherche :

« Un élément caractéristique de notre recommandation, qui exige une explication et une justification, est le supplément inconditionnel qui accompagne chaque subvention pour la recherche et chaque bourse au niveau gradué. C'est là un usage établi aux États-Unis. Il est fondé sur l'idée qu'une part substantielle des traitements des professeurs doit être imputée à la recherche et que le Gouvernement fédéral devrait prendre à sa charge une plus grande partie du coût total de la recherche que celle qu'il prend actuellement et qui consiste en des subventions pour fins de fonctionnement ne couvrant que les fournitures, l'équipement, la rémunération des étudiants-assistants et des techniciens.

On a beaucoup attiré notre attention sur les problèmes spéciaux des petites et des nouvelles universités. Elles doivent rivaliser dans la course avec les grandes universités, plus puissantes, et mieux établies, pour obtenir des subventions de recherche. Cela est juste et convenable : l'argent pour la recherche doit être placé là où il est le plus productif. Mais la productivité à long terme requiert que des subventions d'essai soient faites à des chercheurs dont la renommée n'est pas encore établie et à une échelle plus généreuse que présentement. On devrait leur accorder, pendant quelques années, le bénéfice du doute, leur permettre de se développer de façon que, par la suite, ils n'aient pas besoin d'un traitement de faveur. En procédant ainsi, nous édifierons un corps plus nombreux de savants consacrés à la recherche et un groupe d'universités plus fortes.

C'est pour ces raisons mêmes que nous recommandons une subvention générale de soutien à la recherche, à chaque université, proportionnée à l'importance de son personnel. Des subventions de ce genre aideraient beaucoup à supprimer le danger que l'Association des Écoles de gradués a détecté, et qui consiste à permettre à des organismes de l'extérieur d'exercer une influence injustifiée sur la détermination

[1] Le financement de l'enseignement supérieur au Canada, rapport d'une Commission d'enquête à l'Association des Universités et Collèges du Canada, les Presses de l'université Laval et University of Toronto Press, 1965, pp. 78-79.

tableau 1 CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: *dépenses annuelles sous forme d'aide directe et indirecte, distribution procentuelle des déboursés selon la nature de l'aide, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967*

forme d'aide	1964-1965		1965-1966		1966-1967	
	$'000	%	$'000	%	$'000	%
AIDE DIRECTE						
1. subventions de recherche aux chercheurs des universités						
subventions aux travaux de recherche	8 970	47.7	11 920	49.8	17 482	47.4
subventions à l'achat d'appareils de recherche	2 152	11.4	2 305	9.6	5 785	15.7
subventions importantes: ordinateurs, instituts, achat d'appareils majeurs spéciaux	1 826	9.7	2 004	8.4	3 713	10.1
subventions générales de recherches	589	3.1	760	3.2	965	2.6
indemnité de voyage	222	1.2	236	1.0	410	1.1
2. subventions de recherche de la Commission de contrôle de l'énergie atomique aux chercheurs des universités	1 250	6.7	1 600	6.7	2 000	5.4
3. bourses	2 815	15.0	3 939	16.5	5 041	13.7
total	17 824	94.8	22 764	95.2	35 397	96.0
AIDE INDIRECTE						
1. aide aux activités scientifiques et à la publication de revues scientifiques	984	5.2	1 159	4.8	1 480	4.0
total	984	5.2	1 159	4.8	1 480	4.0
TOTAL: aide directe et indirecte	*18 808*	*100.0*	*23 923*	*100.0*	*36 877*	*100.0*

de la politique de recherches de l'université. Nous proposons que ces subventions s'élèvent à 10 pour cent du total des salaires du personnel enseignant à plein temps, plutôt que d'en fixer le montant d'après le nombre total du personnel, car les professeurs qui ont de l'expérience ont généralement plus besoin de fonds que les débutants : on peut s'attendre aussi à ce qu'ils produisent plus [2]. »

Depuis le rapport de la Commission Bladen, le Conseil national de recherches maintient pourtant sa politique générale. Le budget de 1966-1967 atteint 36.9 millions. Mais tel que recommandé, aucun supplément aux subventions et aux bourses n'acquitte une partie du traitement des chercheurs. En ce qui a trait aux subventions générales de recherches que le Conseil verse à sa discrétion aux recteurs des universités, le montant total actuel représente moins de un pour cent des traitements du personnel enseignant. Et encore, la distribution de ces sommes continue de favoriser les universités bien établies dans le domaine de la recherche parce que le montant des subventions aux travaux de recherche l'année précédente sert de base au calcul de la subvention générale de recherches.

Nous examinerons successivement entre 1964-1965 et 1966-1967 :

I. les différents aspects du programme d'aide du Conseil;

II. la hausse des subventions selon le secteur de recherche;

III. les universités selon la taille;

IV. les subventions totales et les subventions moyennes selon le groupe d'universités.

I. PROGRAMME D'AIDE DU CONSEIL — tableau I

Entre 1964-1965 et 1966-1967, l'aide directe à la recherche sous forme de subventions aux travaux de recherche et à l'achat d'appareils de recherche, de subventions générales de recherches, de bourses constitue environ 95 pour cent du programme d'aide du Conseil à la recherche scientifique. Entre 4 et 5 pour cent des dépenses sont affectées à la publication de revues scientifiques et à des activités scientifiques générales.

Les subventions aux travaux de recherche totalisent 17.5 millions

[2] ibid., p. 87.

tableau 2 CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: *selon le secteur de recherche et la nature des subventions, augmentation procentuelle entre 1964-1965 et 1965-1966, entre 1965-1966 et 1966-1967, et hausse annuelle moyenne entre 1964-1965 et 1966-1967*

secteur	subventions aux travaux			subventions à l'achat			subventions totales		
	augmentation entre		augmentation annuelle moyenne entre 1964-65 et 1966-67	augmentation entre		augmentation annuelle moyenne entre 1964-65 et 1966-67	augmentation entre		augmentation annuelle moyenne entre 1964-65 et 1966-67
	1964-65 et 1965-66	1965-66 et 1966-67		1964-65 et 1965-66	1965-66 et 1966-67		1964-65 et 1965-66	1965-66 et 1966-67	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
agriculture et foresterie	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
biologie	30.2	- 1.0	14.5	- 14.5	113.1	41.1	22.8	12.0	18.8
chimie	25.0	38.3	36.4	31.1	131.2	101.5	26.2	58.3	49.9
psychologie expérimentale	100.7	70.5	121.2	-	25.0	-	110.1	68.5	127.0
recherche spatiale	50.0	115.0	111.3	-	782.2	-	58.3	150.1	148.1
recherches dentaires	30.6	44.1	44.1	-	-	29.5	- 3.2	86.5	40.3
physique	33.8	30.3	37.2	19.7	81.8	58.9	30.3	42.0	42.6
sciences de la terre	27.6	46.9	43.7	- 11.0	50.9	17.2	18.0	47.7	37.2
génie	36.8	39.0	45.1	24.3	163.0	113.4	34.7	58.6	56.8
génie chimique et métallurgique	34.6	50.0	50.9	- 15.0	386.9	157.1	23.7	100.7	74.2
mathématiques pures et appliquées	53.6	105.0	107.4	-	-	-	53.6	105.0	107.4
informatique	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
t o t a l	32.9	46.6	47.5	7.1	105.9	84.4	27.9	63.5	54.6
Commission de contrôle de l'énergie atomique	28.0	25.0	30.0	-	-	-	28.0	25.0	30.0
ordinateurs	-	-	-	53.0	41.5	58.3	53.0	41.5	58.3
appareils majeurs spéciaux	176.2	71.3	186.5	- 44.8	207.4	34.9	- 20.1	154.8	51.8
instituts	17.5	29.9	26.3	-	-	-	17.5	49.3	37.7
T O T A L	33.3	44.3	46.2	2.7	132.5	69.4	25.6	62.5	52.1

en 1966-1967 par rapport à 8.9 millions en 1964-1965. Cet article du budget représente près de la moitié des dépenses du Conseil. Au cours des trois dernières années, le Conseil verse 10.2 millions pour l'achat d'appareils de recherche, soit 12.9 pour cent des déboursés. De plus quelque 10 pour cent du budget est affecté à l'achat d'ordinateurs, à l'achat d'appareils de recherche coûtant entre $5 000 et $100 000 et à la subvention de quelques instituts de recherche affiliés à des universités. Les subventions générales de recherches représentent quelque 3 pour cent des dépenses. Le montant des bourses atteint 5 millions en 1966-1967 par rapport à 2.8 millions, deux ans plus tôt. Le Conseil consacre à la publication de huit revues scientifiques 459 000 dollars en 1964-1965, 551 000 l'année suivante et en 1966-1967, 711 000 dollars. Ces sommes acquittent les frais d'administration et le coût de publication.

II. HAUSSE DES SUBVENTIONS SELON LE SECTEUR DE RECHERCHE — tableau 2

L'augmentation des subventions aux travaux de recherche se chiffre à 33.2 pour cent entre 1964-1965 et 1965-1966 et à 44.3 pour cent entre 1965-1966 et 1966-1967. L'accroissement des subventions à l'achat d'appareils de recherche n'est que de 2.7 pour cent entre 1964-1965 et 1965-1966 mais il atteint 132.5 pour cent entre 1965-1966 et 1966-1967. Durant cette période, la hausse annuelle moyenne des subventions à l'achat est plus rapide que celle des subventions aux travaux : 69.4 pour cent par rapport à 46.2 pour cent.

Cette tendance se remarque également dans tous les secteurs de recherche, à l'exception de *recherches dentaires* (29.5 pour cent par rapport à 44.1 pour cent), *sciences de la terre* (17.2 pour cent par rapport à 43.7 pour cent) et *appareils majeurs spéciaux* (34.9 pour cent par rapport à 186.5 pour cent).

Les hausses annuelles moyennes des subventions aux travaux et des subventions totales sont les plus faibles dans le secteur *biologie* (14.5 pour cent et 18.8 pour cent), secteur qui détient le cinquième de l'ensemble des subventions en 1964-1965 et 1965-1966. En trois ans, les subventions en *recherche spatiale* quadruplent, elles triplent en *mathématiques pures et appliquées.*

Si l'on classe en ordre décroissant les secteurs de recherche selon le montant des subventions aux travaux de recherche en 1964-1965, l'on observe (tableau 3) que l'augmentation annuelle moyenne entre

1964-1965 et 1966-1967 est plus importante dans les secteurs qui reçoivent une aide moindre au début de la période.

tableau 3 *CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: selon le secteur de recherche classé en ordre décroissant d'après le montant des subventions aux travaux en 1964-1965, augmentation annuelle moyenne des subventions aux travaux entre 1964-1965 et 1966-1967*

secteur de recherche	subventions de 1964-1965	augmentation annuelle moyenne entre 1964-1965 et 1966-1967
	$'000	%
biologie	2 311	14.5
chimie	2 044	36.4
physique	1 213	37.2
génie	1 193	45.1
sciences de la terre	888	43.7
génie chimique et métallurgique	617	50.9
psychologie expérimentale	213	121.2
mathématiques pures et appliquées	206	107.4
recherches dentaires	165	44.1
recherche spatiale	120	111.3

III. UNIVERSITÉS GROUPÉES SELON LA TAILLE

Nous groupons les universités selon la taille mesurée en fonction du nombre de professeurs à temps complet. Les chiffres sur le nombre de professeurs sont recueillis par le Bureau fédéral de la statistique lors de l'enquête annuelle sur les traitements. Tous les professeurs ne peuvent certes pas bénéficier éventuellement d'une subvention du Conseil mais les chiffres sur le nombre de professeurs en sciences ne sont pas publiés.

Nous distinguons quatre groupes d'universités. En général parmi les petites universités nous retrouvons les nouvelles universités et celles dont le programme d'étude du deuxième et troisième cycles est embryonnaire ou moins développé. Les très grandes universités jouissent déjà

d'une réputation en matière de recherche.

Le tableau 4-a indique le pourcentage des professeurs dans chacun des groupes d'universités entre 1964-1965 et 1966-1967.

tableau 4-a — *UNIVERSITÉS GROUPÉES SELON LA TAILLE: pourcentage des professeurs selon le groupe, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967*

g r o u p e	1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967
	%	%	%
groupe 1	22.5	20.1	21.7
groupe 2	23.5	21.0	23.1
groupe 3	23.5	24.9	24.2
groupe 4	30.5	34.0	31.0

Le tableau 4-b fournit la mesure de la taille des universités classées dans chacun des groupes durant ces trois années.

tableau 4-b — *UNIVERSITÉS GROUPÉES SELON LA TAILLE: nombre de professeurs des universités selon l'intervalle de chacun des groupes, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967*

g r o u p e	1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967
	n o	n o	n o
groupe 1	moins de 200 professeurs	moins de 200 professeurs	moins de 250 professeurs
groupe 2	200 - 399 professeurs	200 - 399 professeurs	250 - 499 professeurs
groupe 3	400 - 799 professeurs	400 - 694 professeurs	500 - 799 professeurs
groupe 4	800 professeurs et plus	695 professeurs et plus	800 professeurs et plus

[3] nous ajoutons au *groupe 1* les quelques subventions versées à des chercheurs qui ne sont pas attachés à une université.

La tableau 4-c dresse la liste des universités selon le groupe durant les moments de cette période. [3]

tableau 4-c *UNIVERSITÉS GROUPÉES SELON LA TAILLE: liste des universités classées suivant le groupe, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967*

groupe	liste des universités
groupe 1	
1964-1965	Alberta, U. B. C., Toronto
1965-1966	Alberta, U. B. C., McGill, Toronto
1966-1967	Alberta, U. B. C., McGill, Toronto
groupe 2	
1964-1965	Laval, McGill, Manitoba, Saskatchewan
1965-1966	Laval, Manitoba, Montréal, Saskatchewan, Western
1966-1967	Laval, Manitoba, Montréal, Saskatchewan, Western
groupe 3	
1964-1965	Guelph, McMaster, Montréal, Ottawa, Queen's, Waterloo, Western
1965-1966	Calgary, Dalhousie, Guelph, McMaster, U. N. B., Ottawa, Queen's, Waterloo
1966-1967	Calgary, Dalhousie, Guelph, McMaster, U. N. B., Ottawa, Queen's, Simon Fraser, Waterloo
groupe 4	
de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967	toutes les autres universités non classées dans les groupes 1, 2, 3

IV. SUBVENTIONS TOTALES ET SUBVENTIONS MOYENNES SELON LE GROUPE D'UNIVERSITÉS

a. subventions aux travaux de recherche

Les sommes affectées aux travaux de recherche (tableau 5) se chiffrent à 10.6 millions de dollars en 1964-1965, à 14.1 millions en 1965-1966 et en 1966-1967, à 20.4 millions, soit une augmentation annuelle moyenne de 46.2 pour cent. Le nombre des subventions

tableau 5

CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: selon le secteur, nombre et total des subventions aux travaux de recherche et à l'achat d'appareils de recherche, et subventions moyennes, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967

secteur		subventions aux travaux de recherche			subventions à l'achat d'appareils de recherche		
		1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967	1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967
		(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)
agriculture et foresterie	total	- -	- -	1 332 729 (243)	- -	- -	244 500 (28)
	moyenne	-	-	5 484	-	-	8 732
biologie	total	2 311 131 (400)	3 007 414 (539)	2 978 099 (486)	450 752 (31)	385 417 (32)	821 394 (58)
	moyenne	5 778	5 580	6 128	14 540	12 044	14 162
chimie	total	2 043 865 (324)	2 553 873 (402)	3 532 162 (496)	533 375 (37)	699 005 (28)	1 616 061 (75)
	moyenne	6 308	6 353	7 121	14 416	24 964	21 547
psychologie expérimentale	total	213 064 (61)	427 674 (90)	729 257 (132)	- -	20 000 (1)	25 000 (3)
	moyenne	3 493	4 752	5 525	-	20 000	8 333
recherche spatiale	total	120 000 (9)	180 000 (10)	387 050 (28)	- -	10 000 (1)	88 220 (4)
	moyenne	13 333	18 000	13 823	-	10 000	22 055
recherches dentaires	total	165 605 (39)	216 200 (40)	311 500 (44)	57 700 (4)	- -	91 668 (2)
	moyenne	4 246	5 405	7 080	14 425	-	45 834
physique	total	1 213 422 (178)	1 624 100 (226)	2 115 914 (311)	399 300 (26)	478 000 (29)	869 132 (54)
	moyenne	6 817	7 186	6 804	15 358	16 483	16 095
sciences de la terre	total	887 770 (152)	1 132 418 (205)	1 663 670 (270)	291 920 (18)	259 837 (13)	391 995 (13)
	moyenne	5 841	5 524	6 162	16 218	19 987	30 153
génie	total	1 192 568 (200)	1 631 942 (267)	2 267 901 (356)	246 240 (19)	306 077 (22)	805 013 (46)
	moyenne	5 963	6 112	6 371	12 920	13 913	17 500
génie chimique et métallurgique	total	616 684 (115)	829 774 (153)	1 244 550 (194)	172 920 (17)	147 060 (10)	716 036 (35)
	moyenne	5 362	5 423	6 415	10 172	14 706	20 458

tableau 5 (suite)

CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: selon le secteur, nombre et total des subventions aux travaux de recherche et à l'achat d'appareils de recherche, et subventions moyennes, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967

secteur		subventions aux travaux de recherche			subventions à l'achat d'appareils de recherche		
		1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967	1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967
		(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)
mathématiques pures et appliquées	total	206 054 (25)	316 400 (47)	648 540 (174)	- -	- -	- -
	moyenne	8 242	6 732	3 727	-	-	-
informatique	total	- -	- -	267 875 (49)	- -	- -	116 000 (3)
	moyenne	-	-	5 467	-	-	38 667
t o t a l	total	8 970 163 (1503)	11 919 795 (1979)	17 479 247 (2783)	2 152 207 (152)	2 305 396 (136)	5 785 019 (321)
	moyenne	5 968	6 023	6 281	14 159	16 951	18 022
Commission de contrôle de l'énergie atomique	total	1 250 000 (12)	1 600 000 (11)	2 000 000 (12)	- -	- -	- -
	moyenne	104 167	145 455	166 667	-	-	-
ordinateurs	total	- -	- -	- -	600 000 (23)	918 250 (44)	1 299 690 (33)
	moyenne	-	-	-	26 087	20 869	39 385
appareils majeurs spéciaux	total	105 000 (3)	290 000 (4)	496 700 (6)	835 500 (4)	461 000 (5)	1 417 000 (8)
	moyenne	35 000	72 500	82 783	208 875	92 200	177 125
instituts	total	285 000 (3)	335 000 (3)	435 000 (4)	- -	- -	65 000 (2)
	moyenne	95 000	111 667	108 750	-	-	32 500
T O T A L	total	10 610 163 (1521)	14 144 795 (1997)	20 410 947 (2805)	3 587 707 (179)	3 684 646 (185)	8 566 709 (364)
	moyenne	6 976	7 083	7 277	20 043	19 917	23 535

s'accroît également : 1 521 subventions en 1964-1965, 1 997 subventions en 1965-1966 et 2 805 subventions en 1966-1967, soit une augmentation annuelle moyenne de 42.2 pour cent. Le calcul de la subvention moyenne indique que cette moyenne augmente chaque année : $6 976 en 1964-1965, $7 083 en 1965-1966 et en 1966-1967, $7 277, soit une augmentation annuelle moyenne de 2.2 pour cent.

Selon le secteur de recherche, le montant de la subvention moyenne atteint divers niveaux. Les subventions moyennes des secteurs *Commission de contrôle de l'énergie atomique, appareils majeurs spéciaux, instituts* se chiffrent entre $35 000 et $166 667. A cause de leur valeur élevée, ces trois secteurs se comparent difficilement aux autres secteurs de recherche dont la subvention moyenne varie entre $3 493 (*psychologie expérimentale* en 1964-1965) et $18 000 (*recherche spatiale* en 1965-1966). Sauf ces cas extrêmes, la subvention moyenne se situe entre $5 000 et $6 000 en 1964-1965 et $6 000 et $7 000 en 1966-1967.

La subvention moyenne de ces autres secteurs (excl. *Commission de contrôle de l'énergie atomique, appareils majeurs spéciaux et instituts)* atteint $5 968 en 1964-1965, $6 023 en 1965-1966 et en 1966-1967, $6 281, soit un accroissement annuel moyen de 2.6 pour cent. Dans tous ces secteurs durant la période, le montant total des subventions augmente, la valeur de la subvention moyenne s'accroît sauf aux secteurs *mathématiques pures et appliquées* ($8 242 en 1964-1965, $6 732 en 1965-1966 et $3 727 en 1966-1967) et *physique* ($6 817 en 1964-1965, $7 186 en 1965-1966 et en 1966-1967, $6 804).

Les universités sont groupées selon la taille, i.e. selon le nombre de membres de leur personnel enseignant. Rappelons le tableau 4-a : durant la période de trois ans, les *groupes 1, 2* et *3* sont constitués chacun de 20 à 25 pour cent de l'ensemble des professeurs. Le *groupe 4*, à cause de la grande taille du personnel enseignant de ces quelques universités (trois universités en 1964-1965 et quatre universités en 1965-1966 et 1966-1967) représente entre 30 et 34 pour cent de la population des professeurs.

La moyenne des subventions totales selon le groupe d'universités s'accroît en fonction de la taille de l'université. Vu la valeur élevée des subventions moyennes des secteurs *Commission de contrôle de l'énergie atomique, appareils majeurs spéciaux et instituts* et vu le nombre limité de subventions dans ces secteurs, nous utiliserons plutôt le premier total au tableau qui exclut ces trois secteurs.

tableau 6-a

CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: *selon la taille de l'université et le secteur, subventions totales et subventions moyennes aux travaux de recherche, distribution procentuelle des subventions entre les groupes, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967*

secteur de recherche		GROUPE 1						GROUPE 2					
		1964-1965		1965-1966		1966-1967		1964-1965		1965-1966		1966-1967	
			(no)		(no)		(no)		(no)		(no)		(no)
agriculture et foresterie	total	-	-	-	-	1 270	(1)	-	-	-	-	311 086	(76)
	moyenne	-		-		1 270		-		-		4 093	
	%	-		-		0.1		-		-		23.3	
biologie	total	208 126	(51)	267 362	(75)	421 750	(91)	497 894	(106)	580 362	(125)	719 962	(114)
	moyenne	4 081		3 565		4 635		4 697		4 643		6 315	
	%	9.0		8.9		14.2		21.5		19.3		24.2	
chimie	total	311 503	(74)	320 973	(87)	493 904	(101)	594 900	(88)	633 180	(95)	946 403	(140)
	moyenne	4 210		3 689		4 890		6 760		6 665		6 760	
	%	15.2		12.6		14.0		29.1		24.8		26.8	
psychologie expérimentale	total	48 500	(14)	48 176	(12)	108 805	(19)	68 167	(22)	178 599	(39)	306 005	(57)
	moyenne	3 464		4 015		5 727		3 098		4 579		5 369	
	%	22.8		11.3		14.9		32.0		41.7		42.0	
recherche spatiale	total	-	-	10 000	(1)	16 000	(2)	25 000	(2)	40 000	(2)	69 500	(6)
	moyenne	-		10 000		8 000		12 500		20 000		11 583	
	%	-		5.6		4.1		20.8		22.2		18.0	
recherches dentaires	total	5 015	(3)	-	-	2 475	(1)	18 400	(5)	7 000	(3)	6 250	(2)
	moyenne	1 672		-		2 475		3 680		2 333		3 125	
	%	3.0		-		0.8		11.1		3.3		2.0	
physique	total	139 312	(41)	227 800	(49)	222 781	(47)	392 250	(53)	424 100	(61)	633 970	(97)
	moyenne	3 398		4 649		4 740		7 401		6 952		6 536	
	%	11.5		14.0		10.5		32.3		26.1		30.0	
sciences de la terre	total	111 800	(25)	92 150	(26)	114 625	(28)	231 670	(46)	292 200	(53)	415 650	(79)
	moyenne	4 472		3 544		4 094		5 036		5 513		5 261	
	%	12.6		8.1		6.9		26.1		25.8		25.0	
génie	total	131 404	(38)	147 280	(40)	247 259	(55)	281 435	(47)	446 765	(83)	663 100	(104)
	moyenne	3 458		3 682		4 496		5 988		5 383		6 376	
	%	11.0		9.0		10.9		23.6		27.4		29.2	
génie chimique et métallurgique	total	75 038	(19)	72 013	(19)	109 400	(21)	176 073	(40)	271 825	(50)	421 079	(67)
	moyenne	3 949		3 790		5 210		4 402		5 437		6 285	
	%	12.2		8.7		8.8		28.5		32.7		33.8	

tableau 6-b

CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: selon la taille de l'université et le secteur, subventions totales et subventions moyennes aux travaux de recherche, distribution procentuelle des subventions entre les groupes, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967

secteur de recherche		GROUPE 3						GROUPE 4					
		1964-1965		1965-1966		1966-1967		1964-1965		1965-1966		1966-1967	
			(no)		(no)		(no)		(no)		(no)		(no)
agriculture et foresterie	total	-	-	-	-	414 325	(77)	-	-	-	-	606 048	(89)
	moyenne	-		-		5 381		-		-		6 810	
	%	-		-		31.1		-		-		45.5	
biologie	total	739 425	(103)	741 475	(127)	659 650	(105)	865 686	(140)	1 418 215	(212)	1 176 737	(176)
	moyenne	7 179		5 838		6 282		6 183		6 690		6 686	
	%	32.0		24.6		22.1		37.5		47.2		39.5	
chimie	total	417 950	(54)	540 135	(89)	728 834	(109)	719 512	(108)	1 059 585	(131)	1 363 021	(146)
	moyenne	7 740		6 069		6 687		6 662		8 088		9 336	
	%	20.5		21.1		20.6		35.2		41.5		38.6	
psychologie expérimentale	total	52 301	(9)	35 500	(9)	49 400	(15)	44 096	(16)	165 399	(30)	265 047	(41)
	moyenne	5 811		3 944		3 293		2 756		5 513		6 465	
	%	24.5		8.3		6.8		20.7		38.7		36.3	
recherche spatiale	total	47 000	(3)	105 000	(6)	266 550	(19)	48 000	(4)	25 000	(1)	35 000	(1)
	moyenne	15 667		17 500		14 029		12 000		25 000		35 000	
	%	39.2		58.3		68.9		40.0		13.9		9.0	
recherches dentaires	total	59 490	(13)	98 000	(12)	119 720	(15)	82 700	(18)	111 200	(25)	183 055	(26)
	moyenne	4 576		8 167		7 981		4 594		4 448		7 041	
	%	35.9		45.3		38.4		50.0		51.4		58.8	
physique	total	228 600	(31)	378 400	(53)	457 563	(74)	453 260	(53)	593 800	(63)	801 600	(93)
	moyenne	7 374		7 140		6 183		8 552		9 425		8 619	
	%	18.8		23.3		21.6		37.4		36.6		37.9	
sciences de la terre	total	254 900	(41)	229 568	(48)	406 614	(69)	289 400	(40)	518 500	(78)	726 781	(94)
	moyenne	6 217		4 783		5 893		7 235		6 647		7 732	
	%	28.7		20.3		24.4		32.6		45.8		43.7	
génie	total	319 423	(60)	347 524	(64)	491 575	(83)	460 306	(55)	690 373	(80)	865 967	(114)
	moyenne	5 324		5 430		5 923		8 369		8 630		7 596	
	%	26.8		21.3		21.7		38.6		42.3		38.2	
génie chimique et métallurgique	total	92 000	(22)	96 915	(22)	163 000	(33)	273 573	(34)	389 021	(62)	551 071	(73)
	moyenne	4 182		4 405		4 939		8 046		6 275		7 549	
	%	14.9		11.7		13.1		44.4		46.9		44.3	

tableau 6-a (suite)

CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: *selon la taille de l'université et le secteur, subventions totales et subventions moyennes aux travaux de recherche, distribution procentuelle des subventions entre les groupes, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967*

secteur de recherche		GROUPE 1						GROUPE 2					
		1964-1965		1965-1966		1966-1967		1964-1965		1965-1966		1966-1967	
			(no)		(no)		(no)		(no)		(no)		(no)
mathématiques pures et appliquées	total	8 360	(2)	13 400	(9)	23 763	(13)	86 054	(13)	74 050	(13)	158 350	(41)
	moyenne	4 180		1 489		1 828		6 620		5 696		3 862	
	%	4.0		4.2		3.7		41.8		23.4		24.4	
informatique	total	-	-	-	-	22 000	(5)	-	-	-	-	42 261	(12)
	moyenne	-		-		4 400		-		-		3 522	
	%	-		-		8.2		-		-		15.8	
t o t a l	total	1 039 058	(267)	1 199 154	(318)	1 784 032	(384)	2 371 843	(422)	2 948 081	(524)	4 693 616	(795)
	moyenne	3 892		3 771		4 646		5 620		5 626		5 904	
	%	11.6		10.1		10.2		26.4		24.7		26.9	
Commission de contrôle de l'énergie atomique	total	-	-	-	-	5 600	(1)	268 000	(3)	315 800	(2)	269 000	(2)
	moyenne	-		-		5 600		89 333		157 900		134 500	
	%	-		-		0.3		21.5		19.7		13.5	
ordinateurs	total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	moyenne	-		-		-		-		-		-	
	%	-		-		-		-		-		-	
appareils majeurs spéciaux	total	-	-	62 500	(1½)	81 450	(2½)	25 000	(1)	12 500	(½)	21 450	(1½)
	moyenne	-		41 667		32 580		25 000		25 000		14 300	
	%	-		21.6		16.4		23.8		4.3		4.3	
instituts	total	100 000	(1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	120 000	(1)	120 000	(1)
	moyenne	100 000		-		-		-		120 000		120 000	
	%	35.1		-		-		-		35.8		27.6	
T O T A L	*total*	*1 139 058*	*(268)*	*1 261 654*	*(319½)*	*1 871 082*	*(387½)*	*2 664 843*	*(426)*	*3 396 381*	*(527½)*	*5 104 066*	*(799½)*
	moyenne	*4 250*		*3 949*		*4 829*		*6 256*		*6 439*		*6 384*	
	%	*10.7*		*8.9*		*9.2*		*25.1*		*24.0*		*25.0*	

tableau 6-b (suite)

CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: *selon la taille de l'université et le secteur, subventions totales et subventions moyennes aux travaux de recherche, distribution procentuelle des subventions entre les groupes, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967*

secteur de recherche		GROUPE 3						GROUPE 4					
		1964-1965		1965-1966		1966-1967		1964-1965		1965-1966		1966-1967	
			(no)		(no)		(no)		(no)		(no)		(no)
mathématiques pures et appliquées	total	27 640	(1)	67 650	(15)	164 177	(44)	84 000	(9)	161 300	(10)	302 250	(76)
	moyenne	27 640		4 510		3 731		9 333		16 130		3 977	
	%	13.4		21.4		25.3		40.8		51.0		46.6	
informatique	total	-	-	-	-	51 125	(9)	-	-	-	-	152 489	(23)
	moyenne	-		-		5 681		-		-		6 630	
	%	-		-		19.1		-		-		56.9	
t o t a l	total	2 238 729	(337)	2 640 167	(445)	3 972 533	(652)	3 320 533	(477)	5 132 393	(692)	7 029 066	(952)
	moyenne	6 643		5 933		6 093		6 961		7 417		7 383	
	%	25.0		22.1		22.7		37.0		43.1		40.2	
Commission de contrôle de l'énergie atomique	total	654 000	(6)	739 200	(5)	951 000	(4)	328 000	(3)	545 000	(4)	774 400	(5)
	moyenne	109 000		147 840		237 750		109 333		136 250		154 880	
	%	52.3		46.2		47.5		26.2		34.1		38.7	
ordinateurs	total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	moyenne	-		-		-		-		-		-	
	%	-		-		-		-		-		-	
appareils majeurs spéciaux	total	30 000	(1)	90 000	(1)	193 800	(1)	50 000	(1)	125 000	(1)	200 000	(1)
	moyenne	30 000		90 000		193 800		50 000		125 000		200 000	
	%	28.6		31.0		39.0		47.6		43.1		40.3	
instituts	total	-	-	-	-	-	-	185 000	(2)	215 000	(2)	315 000	(3)
	moyenne	-		-		-		92 500		107 500		105 000	
	%	-		-		-		64.9		64.2		72.4	
T O T A L	*total*	*2 922 729*	*(344)*	*3 469 367*	*(451)*	*5 117 333*	*(657)*	*3 883 533*	*(483)*	*6 017 393*	*(699)*	*8 318 466*	*(961)*
	moyenne	*8 496*		*7 693*		*7 789*		*8 040*		*8 609*		*8 656*	
	%	27.6		24.5		25.1		36.6		42.6		40.7	

La subvention moyenne selon le groupe (tableau 6-a, 6-b) se situe comme suit en 1964-1965 : *groupe 1* : $3 892; *groupe 2* : $5 620; *groupe 3* : $6 643; *groupe 4* : $6 961. En chiffre absolu, l'écart entre la subvention moyenne du *groupe 1* et celle du *groupe 4* est de $3 069. Cette tendance se maintient en 1965-1966 et 1966-1967.

L'écart entre deux groupes seulement, ne tient pas compte de l'importance relative des autres groupes qui ensemble fixent le niveau de la moyenne générale des quatre groupes. Afin de comparer le niveau de la moyenne d'un groupe par rapport à celle d'un autre groupe et tenir compte de la position de ces deux groupes en relation avec les deux autres groupes, il faut calculer l'écart par rapport à la moyenne générale de l'ensemble des quatre groupes. L'écart est positif si la moyenne du groupe est plus élevée que la moyenne générale; l'écart est négatif lorsque la moyenne du groupe est plus faible que la moyenne de l'ensemble.

Le tableau 7 indique, entre 1964-1965 et 1966-1967, l'écart procentuel entre la moyenne du groupe et la moyenne générale des quatre groupes selon le secteur de recherche et pour l'ensemble des subventions.

En 1964-1965, pour l'ensemble des subventions versées au *groupe 1*, le pourcentage de l'écart à la moyenne générale est de -34.8 pour cent, au *groupe 2* de -5.8 pour cent, au *groupe 3* de 11.3 pour cent et au *groupe 4* de 16.6 pour cent. En 1965-1966 et 1966-1967, seul le *groupe 4* obtient une moyenne de subventions plus forte (23.1 et 17.5 pour cent) que la moyenne générale. L'écart de 1964-1965, accusé entre le *groupe 1* et le *groupe 4*, s'élargit en 1965-1966 : 60.5 pour cent en 1965-1966 par rapport à 51.4 pour cent en 1964-1965; toutefois il se referme en 1966-1967 (43.5 pour cent par rapport à 51.4 pour cent en 1964-1965 et 60.5 pour cent en 1965-1966).

Au *groupe 1*, l'écart est négatif dans tous les secteurs de recherche à l'exception de *psychologie expérimentale* en 1966-1967 (3.7 pour cent). L'écart se déplace inscrivant -77.8 pour cent en *mathématiques pures et appliquées* (1965-1966) et 3.7 pour cent. Dans tous les secteurs cependant, la subvention moyenne du *groupe 1* se rapproche davantage de la moyenne générale entre 1965-1966 et 1966-1967.

Au *groupe 2*, l'écart selon le secteur de recherche est habituellement négatif; il se déplace généralement entre -20 pour cent et 10 pour cent.

Au *groupe 3* depuis 1964-1965, la subvention moyenne selon la

tableau 7

CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: selon le secteur des subventions aux travaux de recherche et le groupe d'universités, écart procentuel entre la moyenne du groupe et la moyenne générale des quatre groupes, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967

s e c t e u r	1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967
	%	%	%
biologie			
groupe 1	- 29.4	- 36.1	- 24.4
groupe 2	- 18.7	- 16.8	3.1
groupe 3	24.2	4.6	2.5
groupe 4	7.0	19.9	9.1
chimie			
groupe 1	- 33.3	- 41.9	- 31.3
groupe 2	7.2	4.9	- 5.1
groupe 3	22.7	9.6	- 6.1
groupe 4	5.6	27.3	31.1
physique			
groupe 1	- 50.2	- 35.3	- 30.3
groupe 2	8.6	- 3.3	- 3.9
groupe 3	8.2	- 0.6	- 9.1
groupe 4	25.5	31.2	26.7
génie			
groupe 1	- 42.0	- 29.8	- 29.4
groupe 2	0.4	- 11.9	0.1
groupe 3	- 10.7	- 11.2	- 7.0
groupe 4	40.3	41.2	19.2
génie chimique et métallurgique			
groupe 1	- 26.4	- 30.1	- 18.8
groupe 2	- 17.9	0.3	- 2.0
groupe 3	- 22.0	- 18.8	- 23.0
groupe 4	50.1	15.7	17.7
sciences de la terre			
groupe 1	- 23.4	- 35.8	- 33.6
groupe 2	- 13.8	- 0.2	- 14.6
groupe 3	6.4	- 13.4	- 4.4
groupe 4	23.9	20.3	25.5
psychologie expérimentale			
groupe 1	- 0.8	- 15.5	3.7
groupe 2	- 11.3	- 3.6	- 2.8
groupe 3	66.4	- 17.0	- 40.4
groupe 4	- 21.1	16.0	17.0

tableau 7 (suite)

CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: selon le secteur des subventions aux travaux de recherche et le groupe d'universités, écart procentuel entre la moyenne du groupe et la moyenne générale des quatre groupes, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967

secteur	1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967
	%	%	%
recherche spatiale			
groupe 1	-	- 44.4	- 42.1
groupe 2	- 6.2	11.1	- 16.2
groupe 3	17.5	- 2.8	1.5
groupe 4	- 10.0	38.9	153.2
recherches dentaires			
groupe 1	- 60.6	-	- 65.0
groupe 2	- 13.3	- 56.8	- 55.9
groupe 3	7.8	51.1	12.7
groupe 4	8.2	- 17.7	- 0.6
agriculture et foresterie			
groupe 1	-	-	- 76.8
groupe 2	-	-	- 25.4
groupe 3	-	-	- 1.9
groupe 4	-	-	24.2
informatique			
groupe 1	-	-	- 19.5
groupe 2	-	-	- 35.6
groupe 3	-	-	3.9
groupe 4	-	-	21.3
mathématiques pures et appliquées			
groupe 1	- 49.3	- 77.8	- 51.0
groupe 2	- 19.7	- 15.4	3.6
groupe 3	235.4	- 33.0	0.1
groupe 4	13.2	139.6	6.7
total			
groupe 1	- 34.8	- 37.4	- 26.0
groupe 2	- 5.8	- 6.6	- 6.0
groupe 3	11.3	- 1.5	- 3.0
groupe 4	16.6	23.1	17.5

discipline diminue relativement à la subvention moyenne de l'ensemble. L'écart procentuel au total des subventions indique d'ailleurs cette tendance : en 1964-1965, l'écart est positif (11.3 pour cent); en 1965-1966 et 1966-1967, l'écart est négatif (-1.5 pour cent et -3.0 pour cent).

Dans tous les secteurs de recherche, les subventions moyennes versées aux universités du *groupe 4* sont plus fortes que la moyenne générale des subventions sauf en *psychologie expérimentale* (-21.1 pour cent en 1964-1965), en *recherche spatiale* (-10.0 pour cent en 1964-1965) et en *recherches dentaires* (-17.7 pour cent en 1965-1966, -0.6 pour cent en 1966-1967). L'écart positif se déplace entre 5.6 pour cent et 153.2 pour cent.

Nous pourrions examiner la distribution du nombre de subventions selon le groupe d'universités. Nous tenons indirectement compte de ce facteur au moyen du calcul de la subvention moyenne. Une bonne politique de recherche ne doit pas viser à morceler les sommes limitées entre un trop grand nombre parce que si le montant distribué à chacun devenait dérisoire, il constituerait un investissement peu productif. Observons plutôt la partie du montant global que reçoit annuellement chaque groupe d'universités (tableaux 6-a et 6-b).

Les *groupes 2* et *3* bénéficient, entre 1964-1965 et 1966-1967, d'un pourcentage des subventions totales quelque peu plus élevé que celui que représente le nombre de leurs professeurs. Les subventions des *groupes 2* et *3* se chiffrent entre 23 et 27 pour cent du total, leur population respective compte entre 21 et 24 pour cent des professeurs. Les universités du *groupe 1,* dont la population groupe entre 20 et 22 pour cent des professeurs reçoivent entre 10 et 11 pour cent des subventions. Quant au *groupe 4,* la population varie entre 30 et 34 pour cent de l'ensemble des professeurs, il retire entre 37 et 42 pour cent des subventions.

b. subventions à l'achat d'appareils de recherche

A l'article achat d'appareils de recherche (tableau 5), le Conseil dépense 3.6 millions en 1964-1965, 3.7 millions l'année suivante et en 1966-1967, 8.6 millions; l'augmentation au cours de cette période se chiffre à 138.8 pour cent. Le nombre de subventions double entre 1964-1965 et 1966-1967 : 179 en 1964-1965, 185 en 1965-1966 et en 1966-1967, 364; l'augmentation est de 203.4 pour cent. La subvention annuelle moyenne se situe à $20 043 en 1964-1965, $19 917 en

tableau 8-a

CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: selon la taille de l'université et le secteur, subventions totales et subventions moyennes à l'achat d'appareils de recherche, distribution procentuelle des subventions entre les groupes, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967

secteur		GROUPE 1			GROUPE 2		
		1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967	1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967
		(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)
agriculture et foresterie	total	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	88 000 (12)
	moyenne	-	-	-	-	-	7 333
	%	-	-	-	-	-	36.0
biologie	total	38 532 (3)	68 120 (6)	123 394 (11)	123 000 (5)	97 652 (8)	246 833 (15)
	moyenne	12 844	11 353	11 218	24 600	12 207	16 456
	%	8.5	17.7	15.0	27.3	25.3	30.0
chimie	total	60 850 (5)	150 000 (6)	117 336 (9)	183 200 (9)	19 500 (2)	493 223 (21)
	moyenne	12 170	25 000	13 037	20 356	9 750	23 487
	%	11.4	21.4	7.3	34.3	2.8	30.5
psychologie expérimentale	total	- -	- -	15 000 (1)	- -	- -	5 000 (1)
	moyenne	-	-	15 000	-	-	5 000
	%	-	-	60.0	-	-	20.0
recherche spatiale	total	- -	- -	- -	- -	10 000 (1)	- -
	moyenne	-	-	-	-	10 000	-
	%	-	-	-	-	100.0	-
recherches dentaires	total	- -	- -	- -	2 500 (1)	- -	- -
	moyenne	-	-	-	2 500	-	-
	%	-	-	-	4.3	-	-
physique	total	19 000 (2)	66 000 (5)	122 400 (9)	139 400 (7)	247 000 (10)	278 200 (18)
	moyenne	9 500	13 200	13 600	19 914	24 700	15 456
	%	4.8	13.8	14.1	34.9	51.7	32.0
sciences de la terre	total	39 000 (4)	64 077 (3)	15 000 (1)	102 000 (3)	39 200 (3)	66 600 (4)
	moyenne	9 750	21 359	15 000	34 000	13 067	16 650
	%	13.4	24.6	3.8	34.9	15.1	17.0
génie	total	18 500 (2)	20 000 (1)	51 500 (3)	49 300 (5)	86 900 (7)	267 984 (19)
	moyenne	9 250	20 000	17 167	9 860	12 414	14 104
	%	7.5	6.5	6.4	20.0	28.4	33.3
génie chimique et métallurgique	total	- -	- -	104 500 (4)	39 870 (3)	47 500 (3)	207 430 (14)
	moyenne	-	-	26 125	13 290	15 833	14 816
	%	-	-	14.6	23.0	32.3	29.0

tableau 8-b

CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: *selon la taille de l'université et le secteur, subventions totales et subventions moyennes à l'achat d'appareils de recherche, distribution procentuelle des subventions entre les groupes, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967*

secteur		GROUPE 3			GROUPE 4		
		1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967	1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967
		(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)
agriculture et foresterie	total	- -	- -	55 500 (5)	- -	- -	101 000 (11)
	moyenne	-	-	11 100	-	-	9 182
	%	-	-	22.7	-	-	41.3
biologie	total	148 633 (10)	80 045 (7)	204 195 (12)	140 587 (13)	139 600 (11)	246 972 (20)
	moyenne	14 863	11 435	17 016	10 814	12 691	12 349
	%	33.0	20.8	24.9	31.2	36.2	30.1
chimie	total	59 500 (5)	190 000 (7)	363 241 (16)	229 825 (18)	339 505 (13)	642 261 (29)
	moyenne	11 900	27 143	22 703	12 768	26 116	22 147
	%	11.2	27.2	22.5	43.1	48.6	39.7
psychologie expérimentale	total	- -	- -	- -	- -	20 000 (1)	5 000 (1)
	moyenne	-	-	-	-	20 000	5 000
	%	-	-	-	-	100.0	20.0
recherche spatiale	total	- -	- -	64 390 (3)	- -	- -	23 830 (1)
	moyenne	-	-	21 463	-	-	23 830
	%	-	-	73.0	-	-	27.0
recherches dentaires	total	4 000 (1)	- -	10 000 (1)	51 200 (2)	- -	81 668 (1)
	moyenne	4 000	-	10 000	25 600	-	81 668
	%	6.9	-	10.9	88.8	-	89.1
physique	total	75 000 (6)	70 000 (3)	226 750 (14)	165 900 (11)	95 000 (11)	241 782 (13)
	moyenne	12 500	23 333	16 196	15 082	8 636	18 599
	%	18.8	14.6	26.1	41.5	19.9	27.8
sciences de la terre	total	63 170 (6)	96 600 (4)	237 500 (4)	87 750 (5)	59 960 (3)	72 895 (4)
	moyenne	10 528	24 150	59 375	17 550	19 987	18 224
	%	21.6	37.2	60.6	30.1	23.1	18.6
génie	total	80 240 (4)	113 555 (5)	259 890 (13)	98 200 (8)	85 622 (9)	225 639 (11)
	moyenne	20 060	22 711	19 992	12 275	9 514	20 513
	%	32.6	37.1	32.3	39.9	28.0	28.0
génie chimique et métallurgique	total	54 600 (7)	12 560 (2)	84 700 (5)	78 450 (7)	87 000 (5)	319 406 (12)
	moyenne	7 800	6 280	16 940	11 207	17 400	26 617
	%	31.6	8.5	11.8	45.4	59.2	44.6

tableau 8-a
(suite)

CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: *selon la taille de l'université et le secteur, subventions totales et subventions moyennes à l'achat d'appareils de recherche, distribution procentuelle des subventions entre les groupes, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967*

secteur		GROUPE 1			GROUPE 2		
		1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967	1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967
		(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)
mathématiques pures et appliquées	total	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
	moyenne	-	-	-	-	-	-
	%	-	-	-	-	-	-
informatique	total	- -	- -	25 000 (1)	- -	- -	30 000 (1)
	moyenne	-	-	25 000	-	-	30 000
	%	-	-	21.5	-	-	25.9
t o t a l	total	175 882 (16)	368 197 (21)	574 130 (39)	639 270 (33)	547 752 (34)	1 683 270 (105)
	moyenne	10 993	17 533	14 721	19 372	16 110	16 031
	%	8.2	16.0	9.9	29.7	23.8	29.1
Commission de contrôle de l'énergie atomique	total	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
	moyenne	-	-	-	-	-	-
	%	-	-	-	-	-	-
ordinateurs	total	63 000 (7)	103 100 (12)	166 140 (14)	219 400 (7)	253 600 (11)	329 550 (9)
	moyenne	9 000	8 592	11 867	31 343	23 055	36 617
	%	10.5	11.2	12.8	36.6	27.6	25.3
appareils majeurs spéciaux	total	125 000 (½)	50 000 (1)	300 000 (1)	175 000 (1½)	80 000 (1)	635 000 (3)
	moyenne	250 000	50 000	300 000	116 667	80 000	211 667
	%	15.0	10.8	21.2	20.9	17.4	44.8
instituts	total	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
	moyenne	-	-	-	-	-	-
	%	-	-	-	-	-	-
T O T A L	total	363 882 (23½)	521 297 (34)	1 040 270 (54)	1 033 670 (41½)	881 352 (46)	2 647 820 (117)
	moyenne	15 484	15 332	19 264	24 907	19 160	22 631
	%	10.2	14.2	12.1	28.8	23.9	30.9

tableau 8-b
(suite)

CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: *selon la taille de l'université et le secteur, subventions totales et subventions moyennes à l'achat d'appareils de recherche, distribution procentuelle des subventions entre les groupes, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967*

secteur		GROUPE 3			GROUPE 4		
		1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967	1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967
		(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)
mathématiques pures et appliquées	total	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
	moyenne	-	-	-	-	-	-
	%	-	-	-	-	-	-
informatique	total	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	61 000 (1)
	moyenne	-	-	-	-	-	61 000
	%	-	-	-	-	-	52.6
t o t a l	total	485 143 (39)	562 760 (28)	1 506 166 (73)	851 912 (64)	826 687 (53)	2 021 453 (104)
	moyenne	12 440	20 099	20 632	13 311	15 598	19 437
	%	22.5	24.4	26.0	39.6	35.8	35.0
Commission de contrôle de l'énergie atomique	total	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
	moyenne	-	-	-	-	-	-
	%	-	-	-	-	-	-
ordinateurs	total	97 600 (5)	238 850 (10)	294 900 (6)	220 000 (4)	322 700 (11)	509 100 (4)
	moyenne	19 520	23 885	49 150	55 000	29 336	127 275
	%	16.2	26.0	22.7	36.7	35.2	39.2
appareils majeurs spéciaux	total	35 500 (1)	331 000 (3)	296 000 (2)	500 000 (1)	- -	186 000 (2)
	moyenne	35 500	110 333	148 000	500 000	-	93 000
	%	4.3	71.8	20.9	59.8	-	13.1
instituts	total	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	65 000 (2)
	moyenne	-	-	-	-	-	32 500
	%	-	-	-	-	-	100.0
T O T A L	total	618 243 (45)	1 132 610 (41)	2 097 066 (81)	1 571 912 (69)	1 149 387 (64)	2 781 553 (112)
	moyenne	13 739	27 625	25 890	22 781	17 959	24 835
	%	17.2	30.7	24.5	43.8	31.2	32.5

ASSOCIATION NEWS — COMMUNICATIONS

1. CENTRAL OFFICE DIARY

CHRONIQUE DU SECRÉTARIAT

MARCH - MAY 1968

DE MARS À MAI 1968

March 5 : Executive Secretary to Montreal for a meeting of the Steering Committee of the Commission on Relations between Universities and Governments, and for meetings with Professor Jacques St-Pierre (Nominations Committee) and with Professor Pierre-Paul Proulx (Salaries Committee).

March 12 : Associate Executive Secretary to Toronto for a meeting of the committee planning the annual Canadian Union of Students Seminar.

March 14 : Executive Secretary to Hamilton for meetings with Chairman of the Ontario Council of University Faculty Associations and executive of McMaster University Faculty Association.

March 15-16 : Executive Secretary to Toronto for meetings with the Chairman of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee and executive of York University Faculty Association.

March 16-17 : Executive Secretary and Associate Executive Secretary to Toronto for a meeting of committee of the Executive dealing with professional staff appointments to the Association.

March 26 : Executive Secretary to Montreal for a meeting of Steering Committee of Commission on Relations between Universities and Governments, and for a meeting with executive of Sir George Williams University Faculty Association.

March 28-29 : Executive Secretary to Peterborough for a regular meeting of the Association of the Teaching Staff of Trent University.

April 4 : Executive Secretary to Montreal for meeting of Steering Committee of Commission on Relations between Universities and Governments.

April 5-7 : Executive Secretary to Montreal for a meeting of Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

April 16 : Executive Secretary to Toronto for meetings with the Executive of the Association of the Teaching Staff, University of Toronto, and with the Chairman of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

April 19-20 : Professional staff and members of executive in Ottawa for a regular meeting of the Executive and Finance Committee.

April 23-24 : Associate Executive Secretary to Winnipeg for regular meeting of the Association of the Academic Staff of the University of Manitoba and for meetings with faculty at the University of Winnipeg.

April 25-28 : President and Executive Secretary to Washington, D.C. for the annual convention of the American Association of University Professors.

May 2-3 : Executive Secretary to Guelph for a meeting of the Ontario Council of University Faculty Associations.

May 23-26 : Professional staff and members of executive in Ottawa for a regular meeting of the Executive and Finance Committee and for the spring meeting of Council.

2. FÉDÉRATION DES ASSOCIATIONS DE PROFESSEURS D'UNIVERSITÉS DU QUÉBEC

FEDERATION OF UNIVERSITY FACULTY ASSOCIATIONS OF QUEBEC

Le deux mars dernier se tient à Drummondville la deuxième assemblée du *conseil* de la Fédération des associations de professeurs d'universités du Québec. Le procès-verbal consigne le nom des membres du *bureau de direction* de l'exercice 1968-1969 : monsieur André Côté (Laval) succède à monsieur René Hurtubise (Montréal) à la présidence de l'organisme. Il est assisté de MM. Thomas Pavlasek (McGill), premier vice-président, Jacques Dunnigan (Sherbrooke), second vice-président, Roger Verschingel (Sir George Williams), secrétaire, Bernard Lanctôt (Polytechnique), trésorier.

Face à l'important projet de loi sur les universités du Québec, qui sera présenté au parlement lors de la session en cours, le *conseil* décide de communiquer avec le gouvernement pour obtenir les mêmes droits que la Conférence des recteurs et des principaux des universités du Québec à être consulté et à étudier ce projet de loi.

Au nombre des questions à l'ordre du jour, le président souligne que les études techniques devraient être menées conjointement avec la Conférence des recteurs et que le comité de la F.A.P.U.Q. s'emploie

à l'étude sous l'optique des professeurs. Le *conseil* met aux voix et adopte le texte d'une résolution formulée au gouvernement du Québec dont voici l'essence : « . . . la F.A.P.U.Q. croit qu'une somme supérieure à $90 millions pour les frais de fonctionnement des universités du Québec durant l'année universitaire 1968-1969 est nécessaire pour que le Québec accomplisse ses objectifs en matière d'éducation supérieure ».

3. ONTARIO COUNCIL OF UNIVERSITY FACULTY ASSOCIATIONS

CONSEIL GÉNÉRAL DES ASSOCIATIONS DES PROFESSEURS D'UNIVERSITÉ DE L'ONTARIO

OCUFA recently announced the appointment of Professor Charles M. T. Hanley to the post of Executive Vice-Chairman. Professor Hanley, a member of the Department of Philosophy, University of Toronto, brings to the office nine years of successful university faculty experience and a broad background in public education and service. He will take up his new post on July 1, 1968.

The Council has also formed the following committees :

— Standing Commitee on Pensions (D. M. Winch, Economics, MacMaster, Chairman)

— Taxation Committee (J. A. Johnson, Economics, MacMaster, Chairman)

— Standing Committee on Salaries (R. G. Kidd, Chemistry, Western, Chairman)

— Committee on Community Colleges and Teachers' Colleges (R. Kymlicka, Western, Chairman)

4. OPENINGS IN CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

VACANCES DANS LES UNIVERSITÉS CANADIENNES

For the past few years the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) has published at regular intervals a list of *Openings in Canadian Universities and Colleges* available to individuals on a subscription basis.

In order to increase the distribution of the publication and thereby improve the service it offers, the editorial board has decided to cancel the subscription price for individual members of the Canadian university community.

Beginning with the fall '68 issue, *Openings* will be available *free upon request* to individual faculty members and others in Canadian colleges and universities.

In our judgment, this is a welcome change in policy, one which should do much to improve the distribution of information on academic vacancies in Canadian institutions of higher learning. We urge widespread publicity about this new policy and encourage all faculty members to write A.U.C.C. requesting to be placed on the distribution list for *Openings in Canadian Universities and Colleges.*

Simply send your name and address to :

Openings in Canadian Universities and Colleges
Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada,
151 Slater, Ottawa 4, Ont.

and ask to have your name placed on the mailing list.

1965-1966 et en 1966-1967, à $23 535, soit une augmentation de 17.4 pour cent.

Si l'on compare, pour l'ensemble des subventions selon le groupe d'universités, le pourcentage des subventions aux travaux de recherche (tableaux 6-a et 6-b) au pourcentage des subventions à l'achat d'appareils de recherche (tableaux 8-a et 8-b), le groupe des grandes universités reçoit relativement moins de subventions à l'achat que de subventions aux travaux tel que résumé au tableau 9.

tableau 9 *CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: selon le groupe d'universités, distribution procentuelle des subventions aux travaux et à l'achat, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967*

g r o u p e	subventions aux travaux			subventions à l'achat		
	1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967	1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967
	%	%	%	%	%	%
groupe 1	10.7	8.9	9.2	10.2	14.2	12.1
groupe 2	25.1	24.0	25.0	28.8	23.9	30.9
groupe 3	27.6	24.5	25.1	17.2	30.7	24.5
groupe 4	36.6	42.6	40.7	43.8	31.2	32.5
t o t a l	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

En 1965-1966 et 1966-1967, le *groupe 4* bénéficie de 42.6 et de 40.7 pour cent des subventions aux travaux par rapport à 31.2 et 32.5 pour cent des subventions à l'achat.

Le *groupe 2* obtient, en 1966-1967, 30.9 pour cent des subventions à l'achat alors que la population de ses professeurs compte 23.1 pour cent des professeurs.

La valeur de la subvention moyenne à l'achat d'appareils varie grandement entre les différents moments de la période, entre les secteurs de recherche, entre les groupes d'universités. Contrairement au niveau de la moyenne des subventions aux travaux de recherche, la taille des

tableau 10-a

CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: *selon la taille de l'université et le secteur, subventions totales aux travaux de recherche et à l'achat d'appareils de recherches, distribution procentuelle des subventions entre les groupes, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967*

secteur de recherche		GROUPE 1			GROUPE 2		
		1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967	1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967
agriculture et foresterie	total	-	-	1 270	-	-	399 086
	%	-	-	0.1	-	-	25.3
biologie	total	246 658	335 482	545 144	620 894	678 014	966 795
	%	8.9	9.9	14.4	22.5	20.0	25.4
chimie	total	372 353	470 973	611 240	778 100	652 680	1 439 626
	%	14.5	14.5	11.9	30.2	20.1	28.0
psychologie expérimentale	total	48 500	48 176	123 805	68 167	178 599	311 005
	%	22.8	10.8	16.4	32.0	39.9	41.2
recherche spatiale	total	-	10 000	16 000	25 000	50 000	69 500
	%	-	5.3	3.4	20.8	26.3	14.6
recherches dentaires	total	5 015	-	2 475	20 900	7 000	6 250
	%	2.2	-	0.6	9.4	3.3	1.5
physique	total	158 312	293 800	345 181	531 650	671 100	912 170
	%	9.8	14.0	11.6	33.0	31.9	30.6
sciences de la terre	total	150 800	156 227	129 625	333 670	331 400	482 250
	%	12.8	11.2	6.3	28.3	23.8	23.5
génie	total	149 904	167 280	298 759	330 735	533 665	931 084
	%	10.4	8.6	9.7	23.0	27.5	30.3
génie chimique et métallurgique	total	75 038	72 013	213 900	215 943	319 325	628 509
	%	9.5	7.4	10.9	27.3	32.7	32.1

tableau 10-b

CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: *selon la taille de l'université et le secteur, subventions totales aux travaux de recherche et à l'achat d'appareils de recherches, distribution procentuelle des subventions entre les groupes, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967*

secteur de recherche		GROUPE 3			GROUPE 4		
		1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967	1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967
agriculture et foresterie	total	-	-	469 825	-	-	707 048
	%	-	-	29.8	-	-	44.8
biologie	total	888 058	821 520	863 845	1 006 273	1 557 815	1 423 709
	%	32.2	24.2	22.7	36.4	45.9	37.5
chimie	total	477 450	730 135	1 092 075	949 337	1 399 090	2 005 282
	%	18.5	22.4	21.2	36.8	43.0	38.9
psychologie expérimentale	total	52 301	35 500	49 400	44 096	185 399	270 047
	%	24.5	7.9	6.6	20.7	41.4	35.8
recherche spatiale	total	47 000	105 000	330 940	48 000	25 000	58 830
	%	39.2	55.3	69.6	40.0	13.1	12.4
recherches dentaires	total	63 490	98 000	129 720	133 900	111 200	264 723
	%	28.4	45.3	32.2	60.0	51.4	65.7
physique	total	303 600	448 400	684 313	619 160	688 800	1 043 382
	%	18.8	21.3	22.9	38.4	32.8	34.9
sciences de la terre	total	318 070	326 168	644 114	377 150	578 460	799 676
	%	26.9	23.4	31.3	32.0	41.6	38.9
génie	total	399 663	461 079	751 465	558 506	775 995	1 091 606
	%	27.8	23.8	24.5	38.8	40.1	35.5
génie chimique et métallurgique	total	146 600	109 475	247 700	352 023	476 021	870 477
	%	18.6	11.2	12.6	44.6	48.7	44.4

tableau 10-a (suite)

CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: *selon la taille de l'université et le secteur, subventions totales aux travaux de recherche et à l'achat d'appareils de recherches, distribution procentuelle des subventions entre les groupes, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967*

secteur de recherche		GROUPE 1			GROUPE 2		
		1964-1965	1965-1966	1967-1968	1964-1965	1965-1966	1967-1968
mathématiques pures et appliquées	total	8 360	13 400	23 763	86 054	74 050	158 350
	%	4.0	4.2	3.7	41.8	23.4	24.4
informatique	total	-	-	47 000	-	-	72 261
	%	-	-	12.3	-	-	18.8
t o t a l	total	1 214 940	1 567 351	2 358 162	3 011 113	3 495 833	6 376 886
	%	10.9	11.0	10.1	27.1	24.6	27.4
Commission de contrôle de l'énergie atomique	total	-	-	5 600	268 000	315 800	269 000
	%	-	-	0.3	21.5	19.7	13.5
ordinateurs	total	63 000	103 100	166 140	219 400	253 600	329 550
	%	10.5	11.2	12.8	36.6	27.6	25.3
appareils majeurs spéciaux	total	125 000	112 500	381 450	200 000	92 500	656 450
	%	13.3	15.0	19.9	21.3	12.3	34.3
instituts	total	100 000	-	-	-	120 000	120 000
	%	35.1	-	-	-	35.8	24.0
T O T A L	*total*	*1 502 940*	*1 782 951*	*2 911 352*	*3 698 513*	*4 277 733*	*7 751 886*
	%	*10.6*	*10.0*	*10.1*	*26.1*	*24.0*	*26.7*

tableau 10-b (suite)

CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: selon la taille de l'université et le secteur, subventions totales aux travaux de recherche et à l'achat d'appareils de recherches, distribution procentuelle des subventions entre les groupes, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967

secteur de recherche		GROUPE 3			GROUPE 4		
		1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967	1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967
mathématiques pures et appliquées	total	27 640	67 650	164 177	84 000	161 300	302 250
	%	13.4	21.4	25.3	40.8	51.0	46.6
informatique	total	-	-	51 125	-	-	213 489
	%	-	-	13.3	-	-	55.6
t o t a l	total	2 723 872	3 202 927	5 478 699	4 172 445	5 959 080	9 050 519
	%	24.5	22.5	23.6	37.5	41.9	38.9
Commission de contrôle de l'énergie atomique	total	654 000	739 200	951 000	328 000	545 000	774 400
	%	52.3	46.2	47.5	26.2	34.1	38.7
ordinateurs	total	97 600	238 850	294 900	220 000	322 700	509 100
	%	16.2	26.0	22.7	36.7	35.2	39.2
appareils majeurs spéciaux	total	65 500	421 000	489 800	550 000	125 000	386 000
	%	6.9	56.1	25.6	58.5	16.6	20.2
instituts	total	-	-	-	185 000	215 000	380 000
	%	-	-	-	64.9	64.2	76.0
T O T A L	*total*	*3 540 972*	*4 601 977*	*7 214 399*	*5 455 445*	*7 166 780*	*11 100 019*
	%	24.9	25.8	24.9	38.4	40.2	38.3

tableau 11 *CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES: selon le secteur, subventions totales aux travaux de recherche et à l'achat d'appareils de recherche, de 1964-1965 à 1966-1967*

secteur	total des subventions: travaux et achat		
	1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967
	$	$	$
agriculture et foresterie	-	-	1 577 229
biologie	2 761 883	3 392 831	3 799 493
chimie	2 577 240	3 252 878	5 148 223
psychologie expérimentale	213 064	447 674	754 257
recherche spatiale	120 000	190 000	475 270
recherches dentaires	223 305	216 200	403 168
physique	1 612 722	2 102 100	2 985 046
sciences de la terre	1 179 690	1 392 255	2 055 665
génie	1 438 808	1 938 019	3 072 914
génie chimique et métallurgique	789 604	976 834	1 960 586
mathématiques pures et appliquées	206 054	316 400	648 540
informatique	-	-	383 875
t o t a l	11 122 370	14 225 191	23 264 266
Commission de contrôle de l'énergie atomique	1 250 000	1 600 000	2 000 000
ordinateurs	600 000	918 250	1 299 690
appareils majeurs spéciaux	940 500	751 000	1 913 700
instituts	285 000	335 000	500 000
T O T A L	14 197 870	17 829 441	28 977 656

universités influe moins directement sur le niveau de la subvention moyenne à l'achat d'appareils de recherche.

Mireille Lapointe
chargé de recherches

Sources :

— Bulletin de l'A.C.P.U., tome 15, n° 2, décembre 1966, pp. 53-64.
— ———, tome 15, n° 3, février 1967, pp. 65-81.
— ———, tome 16, n° 3, février 1968, pp. 92-111.
— Compte rendu annuel sur l'aide apportée à la recherche scientifique dans les universités, Conseil national de recherches, Ottawa, 1964-1965, 274 p.
— ———, 1965-1966, 224 p.
— ———, 1966-1967, 280 p.
— Le financement de l'enseignement supérieur au Canada, rapport d'une Commission d'enquête à l'Association des Universités et Collèges du Canada, Les Presses de l'université Laval et University of Toronto Press, 1965, pp. 78-79, 87.

WOULD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING INCREASE ACADEMIC SALARIES ?

ALBERT J. ROBINSON

A suggestion made from time to time by academics, especially in moments of exasperation with university boards and administrators, is that faculty associations and the C.A.U.T. should become labour unions in the full sense, engaging in face-to-face bargaining on behalf of their members rather than drawing up deferential suggestions, and threatening strikes and other forms of collective action if claims are not met. The Canadian and American academic communities are closely linked, and recently academic trade unions have emerged in the United States. In January 1966 professorial picket lines were set up at St. John's University in New York, faculty members went on strike for higher pay at Henry Ford Community College in Michigan, and the American Federation of Teachers, which has many members among college teachers, is affiliated with AFL-CIO and advocates militant trade unionism. Even the staid American Association of University Professors is under pressure to seek recognition as the exclusive representative of the faculty in collective bargaining with university administrations. [1]

In considering trade unionism for academics, the important question is not whether academics could employ union tactics if they wished to, but whether such tactics would achieve the same kind of results which they are presumed to achieve in the typical trade union situation. In other words, is the employer-employee structure of a university so similar to that of an automobile plant, a textile mill or a construction job that it could utilize the same kind of wage-determining machinery with equal success?

The normal situation in trade union bargaining is a dichotomy of individuals into management and labour, and the two groups are engaged in a zero-sum game in which one side's gain is the other side's loss, since an increase in the wages bill reduces profits, and vice versa. In the university, however, faculty and administration are not playing a zero-sum game — savings on faculty salaries do not mean increased profits for presidents, governing boards and administrators. Faculty and administration share a common goal, the enhancement of the

---

[1] M. J. Levine, "Higher Education and Collective Action", *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. XXXVIII(5), May 1967, pp. 263-268.

university's prestige, and if higher salaries attract the caliber of faculty that adds luster to the university, both faculty and administration gain. If the university's prestige falls, both faculty and administration suffer loss. The prestige of the university depends primarily upon the reputation its faculty has achieved in teaching and research; to an important degree, the faculty *is* the university. This is quite different from the typical industrial labour market; certainly the quality of the labour force is important to a firm but it is the decisions of management that determine whether or not it will prosper.

Moreover the most important decisions in the university are made by faculty members — the courses to be taught and the teaching and grading of students are exclusive faculty prerogatives. The conduct of research is a faculty prerogative. Even on administrative matters, most universities have strong faculty representation on various committees. Faculty do not usually control the university payroll, but they have considerably more influence upon it within the administrative system than in the typical union situation because it is the faculty members who fill the office of departmental chairmen, who recommend appointments, relative salaries, salary increases and promotions. In the typical trade union system, the individual worker's relations with management are channelled through the union, whereas for the individual faculty member the faculty association is but one among several institutions for bringing his views before the administration. Foremost among these is, of course, the university senate, though there are other formal and informal means of internal communication.

A second point is that the membership of a trade union is homogeneous with respect to employment. In negotiating a wage rate for carpenters, all of whom have satisfied the union's entrance standards, it could be assumed for practical purposes that all carpenters were equivalent. If there were a job opening for a carpenter, it would be a matter of indifference to the union which member was hired. But this kind of situation will not apply to university teachers. Most obviously, university teachers are not homogeneous with respect to skill; while any member of the carpenters' union may be a near-perfect substitute for any other member, a professor of Spanish is no substitute for a professor of Chemistry in the teaching of Chemistry. Since the strength of demand for highly trained specialists varies from discipline to discipline, a contract negotiated by the union on behalf of all faculty members could be satisfactory for some disciplines but completely out of line with competitive occupations for other disciplines. Even within

one discipline, substitutability may be limited; a Chaucer man may not be qualified to lecture on Hemingway, nor a monetary theorist to lecture on welfare economics. It is interesting to note that the militant American Federation of Teachers draws most of its membership from elementary and secondary school teachers, may of whom apparently believe that graduate work in education provides the wherewithal to teach any course, and in practice many schools do assign teachers to teach subjects in which they have had no formal training.[2] In other words, much of the pressure for unionization in the U.S. comes from teachers who do tend regard themselves as a group which is homogeneous with respect to employment.

Academics are assumed to become more valuable as their experience accumulates, as is indicated by the rank structure of universities and the emphasis on scholarly achievement in assessing the worth of a professor. Actually the more distinguished a professor, the more he becomes a unique commodity — few universities would consider randomly selected professors of English, Economics or Chemistry to be perfect substitutes for Marshall McLuhan, J. K. Galbraith and Linus Pauling. Most academics manage eventually to establish at least a small area of uniqueness for themselves. However, some who are still in the process of establishing a reputation may feel an identity of interest with colleagues in other disciplines: as Levine points out, junior faculty and faculty at institutions which ignore the prestige rating among disciplines may feel that their interests would be served by collective action.[3] But even here the analogy with the orthodox trade union is weak because junior faculty gradually establish themselves, and as they do so they become more closely committed to their disciplines, and their status within their disciplines increases with age. In the typical union, on the other hand, because the peak of manual skill tends to be reached at a relatively early age, pressure for unionism grows stronger with age, as older workers use union membership quotas, seniority rules and the principle of union solidarity to prevent the displacement of older men by younger men.

Another problem in trying to introduce collective bargaining involves control by the association over individual members of the profession and also control of the hiring practices of universities.

---

[2] J. A. Kershaw and R. N. McKean, *Teacher Shortages and Salary Schedules*, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962) pp. 99-115.

[3] Levine, *op. cit.*, p. 267.

A militant stand by a faculty association in which sanctions were an implicit threat would be of little avail if members could not be relied upon to implement sanctions, should negotiations break down. Any categorical commitment by faculty members to sanctions would be a very substantial one in view of the tendency of academic loyalties to be towards disciplines rather than to institutions, and the widespread participation in university administration by academics in their roles as chairman, senate and council members and members of various committees.

Militancy would also be of little avail if the university were free to hire non-association academics to fill any job vacancies at the current salary levels. To make its militancy effective, the faculty association would therefore need some control over the hiring policies and practices of universities — for example, some form of closed shop, such as an agreement by university administrations that no teachers would be hired unless they belonged to the association and at salaries approved by the association, or, in the case of the complete closed shop, that teachers would be hired through the faculty association. The musicians' union might be the appropriate model. Given these two basic conditions, namely control over the university's freedom to hire and control over the individual teacher's freedom to sell his services, the faculty association would be in a strong position to exercise militancy in collective bargaining with university administrations. However, to be able to increase salaries, the faculty association would have to be able to control entry into the academic profession, so that university teachers could be kept scarce enough to maintain salaries at a high level. Effective control over entry into the academic profession would require the political support of provincial governments at least, and perhaps federal support as well. The most common device for this purpose is licensing, which restricts practice of a profession to persons licensed by the government, licensing in turn being placed in the hands of the profession itself. This device is used to control entry into medicine, law, dentistry, undertaking and other occupations.

While control over entry has been achieved in some professions, it should be noted that in most cases the members of these professions practise the same basic skill, with specialization in certain areas. The university, however, embraces many skills, so that if quotas were established, there would have to be separate quotas for each discipline. There would also need to be rigid specification of the minimum qualification of a university teacher. This may not be difficult for

musicians because their skills can be tested relatively easily by an audition. But to set the minimum requirements for a university teacher would necessitate an evaluation of academic qualifications, publications, teaching experience, and any other relevant non-academic experience, which would need to be done separately for each discipline, since different standards apply, e.g. in publications. In order to prevent the circumvention of the association by a university by delaying or accelerating promotions, no doubt qualifications for promotion would have to be determined by the association. Much of the work of an association organized in this manner would be duplicating work already done in the university senate and in the regular departmental system.

The creation of a viable trade union structure for Canadian universities would therefore involve far-reaching changes in the atmosphere of the university, which would no longer be that of a community of scholars but that of a factory. Perhaps this is the direction we are moving in. Traditionally the university was for the sons of the elite, but now it has grown far beyond that. Full-time enrolments have increased seven-fold in the last generation: enrolments in 1939 were 35,000, present enrolments are about 240,000, and according to the Economic Council of Canada, they will be 554,000 in 1975-76. Clearly the future role of the university is to provide mass education, and if this trend results in the transformation of the universities into diploma mills, unionization of the academic mill-hands may not be inappropriate.

However, the question now is whether collective action would improve the present salary and working conditions of the academic. On the one hand, unionization of university teachers would make it difficult to maintain the status of the academic as a professional man in the same sense as physicians, lawyers and dentists, and it would break down the traditional image of the professor as an independent professional expert, both within the university and with the public at large.

On the other hand, it is not clear that this loss of professional status and of the informal atmosphere of the university community would be balanced by significant gains in salaries and other material benefits. The essential condition in the determination of academic salaries is the demand for university education. Demand for university education was at a low level in the 1930's, and academic salaries were low in consequence. Salaries have increased in the 1950's and 1960's because the demand for university education has increased, leading

to a derived demand for academics to teach the growing student body. If student enrolments continue to increase, the demand for academics must also increase. Moreover, since the supply of academics will increase more slowly than the demand, due to the length of the graduate training period and the competitive demand from industry and government for Ph.D. graduates, it seems highly likely that the trend of academic salaries will be upward.

Add to this trend the effect of enrolments in community colleges and technical institutes, which will increase from 26,000 in 1965 to 111,000 in 1975, according to a survey done for the Economic Council of Canada. Since there will be some overlap of requirements of teachers in these institutions and the universities, their growth will undoubtedly help to maintain the scarcity of university teachers.

Moreover, in the United States, which is the main source of foreign-trained teachers for Canadian universities, student enrolments are increasing faster than in Canada, and the demand from American universities and colleges is rising correspondingly faster than in Canada. In addition, the ending of draft deferments of graduate students in 1968-69 is expected to aggravate the shortage of university teachers, especially at the junior level.[4] It therefore does not seem likely that the shortage of Canadian university teachers will be relieved by immigration. Indeed, if past experience is any guide, the failure of Canadian academic salaries to keep pace with the U.S. would be likely to exacerbate the Canadian shortage by attracting Canadian academics to the U.S.

In addition to the demand from U.S. and Canadian universities, men and women with graduate training are in demand from industry and government in both countries.

The outlook for academic salaries therefore looks bright. The market for academics is clearly a sellers' market. The question is whether unionization of the academic profession would enable academics to benefit more from the market situation than with the present loose organization.

It is true that, given a high level of demand for university teachers, well-qualified individuals can improve their real incomes by "campus hopping". Unionization, by reducing the mobility of academics and

---

[4] Statement by The Commission on Federal Relations of the American Council on Education, *New York Times,* November 5, 1967.

formalizing employment relationships, would tend to reduce the gains that the more eminent academics could make in individual bargaining with universities, and this would tend to increase the proportion of such highly-trained individuals flowing into government and business, or into foreign rather than Canadian universities. The loss of such highly paid academics would not necessarily make funds available for the less eminent academics remaining because salary budgets might be smaller. One of the strongest pressures on university budgets comes from competition among universities for the valuable and highly mobile scholars, and if this pressure were taken off, other items in university budgets could be increased instead of faculty salaries, governments could reduce their grants to universities, and grants from outside sources such as foundations and international agencies might dry up if the individuals who attracted them left the university.

At the present time we cannot pronounce unequivocally on the desirability of collective action. The fundamental influence on academic salaries and working conditions is demand. The demand for university teachers is a function of the demand for university education from industry, commerce and government, and the method adopted for determination of salaries will have no significant influence on that. Given the demand, the question is whether collective action would make the academic profession better off financially than under the present unorganized method of salary determination. This article has indicated the formidable requirements for establishing an effective system of collective bargaining, and to achieve it would involve in itself a major change in the nature of the academic profession. If achieved, it would ensure that the benefits of a strong demand were spread more evenly among academics: individual academic "stars" and teachers in disciplines in strong demand outside the university would tend to receive less relative to their colleagues than they do at present, which would also mean that the "stars" would tend to leave the academic profession in Canada, and disciplines in demand outside the university would probably suffer an endemic shortage. Salaries would vary less between academics than they do at present; it is not certain that average salaries would be higher than they would be under the present system. The range of salaries in Canadian universities is not great anyway, so some reduction of the highest levels would provide only limited resources for a very large increase in the lower levels. Any increase in average salaries would involve increasing the salaries budget, and the question is whether salaries budgets would be larger under collective action.

On the one hand, internal university pressures for high salaries to attract or retain distinguished faculty would be diminished once it became clear that "star" salaries would have to be the norm for all salaries. Canadian universities would have to learn to live without the leaders of the academic profession (which is pretty much the present situation). On the other hand, a tightly organized group of university teachers, if organized on a province-wide or possibly a national basis, might successfully pressure the legislatures to increase grants for university salaries provided (a) that the demand for university education was increasing rapidly, (b) that the government could gain votes by allocating more public funds to university education, (c) that the politically sensitive public acquiesced in the use of public funds to raise academic salaries in order to maintain the quality of university education (as distinct from the use of such funds to provide more university places without too much regard to quality, or to reduce the level of tuition fees, for example). However, if all these conditions were present, academics should gain anyway. In the past, average academic salaries have risen as enrolments have increased,[5] without the benefit of collective action.

In conclusion, therefore, although we can make no unequivocal positive statement, it seems fair to say that collective action in the university context would involve the almost certain loss of many valuable features of university teaching. The prospect of real gains is uncertain, and if realized would be relatively small and would not be distributed among all academics. The position might change in the future if the nature of higher education changes, but for the present, the balance seems to be against collective action.

Albert J. Robinson,
York University.

[5] *Salaries and Qualifications of Teachers in Universities and Colleges*, (Ottawa: Dominion Bureau of Statistics, annual); *Survey of Higher Education, Part I: Fall enrolment in Universities and Colleges*, (Ottawa: Dominion Bureau of Statistics, annual).

UNIVERSITY-GOVERNMENT RELATIONS : A CASE IN POINT

Many C.A.U.T. members followed with interest the recent events at the Ontario College of Art, culminating in the intervention of the Minister of University Affairs of Ontario, the Honourable Wm. Davis. It is of some importance that the role of the Association in the affair should be stated briefly here.

The present form of the College is based on an Act of the Government of Ontario, passed in 1912, to provide for instruction in art and related subjects at the college level. The College does not grant degrees, nor has it any close affiliation with a university. It is administered by a Principal who is responsible to a Council (i.e., a Board of Governors), some of whom are nominees of the provincial government. Under the Principal and responsible to him are several department heads. Faculty members are on annual contracts, under a system which requires that they accept their contracts in February of each year, although they do not know until May what their teaching loads will be. Since salaries are based on teaching loads, which are divided into units of a certain number of hours per week, it follows that a faculty member's contractual situation is never reliable for more than a few months at a time. On the other hand, actual immediate dismissal of a faculty member could, under the regulations that were part of the contract, be brought about only with the consent of the Minister.

Although faculty members at the College are not eligible to join C.A.U.T., various C.A.U.T. members have for several years tried to help the faculty of the College in improving the very unprofessional and unsatisfactory conditions under which they are teaching. The Executive Secretary met several times in the past year with officers of the Faculty Association, and on one occasion with the general membership, to discuss their problems, and to advise them about such matters as the development of a reasonable relationship with the Principal and Council, the establishment of a civilized programme of fringe benefits, and the preparation of a faculty handbook.

In February three events brought matters to a head. One of these was the distribution by the Principal of a handbook, prepared by himself with the assistance of the Department Heads, but with neither the knowledge nor the advice of the faculty. The handbook, which the Principal announced to be the basis on which the College would be

administered, in effect spelled out and formalized the inappropriate conditions already existing and at some points provided interpretations that made them worse. After studying this handbook, the C.A.U.T. Executive Secretary wrote to the Minister to protest against conditions at the College.

A second event had to do with an apparent attempt by the administration to make substantial changes in the College curriculum without consultation with the faculty. The student body became deeply concerned over this issue and organized strong demonstrations of protest, in which some faculty members joined.

A third and culminating event was the abrupt and summary dismissal, by the Principal, of two faculty members, who were respectively President of the Faculty Association and Chairman of its Welfare Committee, and who had participated in the protests organized by the students. The Minister had not approved the dismissals. The two faculty members were given no notice. There were no charges. There was no hearing. One of the teachers concerned had been a faculty member for twenty-three years, the other for twelve.

The immediate result was a series of protests addressed to the Minister, urging him to intervene in the affairs of the College. These came from the students, who conducted a protest march on the Legislature, and a boycott of classes; from the C.A.U.T. Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure; from the Ontario Council of University Faculty Associations; from faculty associations at York and Toronto; from other interested organizations, from private citizens, and from the press. The Minister, with great and understandable reluctance, finally agreed to intervene; and there followed the reinstatement of the two teachers and an announcement by the Minister that an appropriate investigation of the College would be carried out.

These are in brief the facts. They are recorded here because of the part played by the various university faculty associations, and also because certain implications and possible misinterpretations of the action of the Minister call for most serious and careful reflection on the part of the academic community. These were well illustrated in an editorial published by the *Globe and Mail* immediately after the Minister's intervention. The editorial hailed the action of the Minister as a salutary precedent, and said : "The academic community in Ontario can no longer consider itself as one entirely apart from the total community, one which as a matter of right determines its own affairs

within its own boundaries." From the editorial ivory tower, it told the universities that they had better behave themselves in the future.

The Executive Secretary replied to this editorial with a letter which, perhaps predictably, the *Globe and Mail* decided not to publish. This letter was as follows :

> "The role of the press in publicizing intelligently the problems of the Ontario College of Art, and in commenting perceptively on them, was admirable. It is unfortunate that you should have followed up so creditable a performance with your March 2 editorial called "Precedent". In hailing the action of the Minister and in implying that the academic community regards itself as "entirely apart from the total community," you ignore some important points.
>
> First, the requests for intervention by the Minister came primarily from the academic community itself : not, apparently, from the administrative side, but from students and faculty members both inside and outside the College, including organizations of university faculty members at campus, provincial, and national levels.
>
> Second, the necessity for intervention clearly stemmed from the failure of the organization of the College to provide adequate procedures for decision-making. The procedures were inadequate in the area of curriculum revision; they were inadequate in the area of faculty appointments and dismissals.
>
> Third, these inadequacies are clearly a product of the Act of the Province of Ontario which set up the College. It was most natural that when the inadequacies became glaringly apparent, the call should have gone from the academic community for intervention and review by the Legislature.
>
> Fourth, a college or university charter or act is intended to establish appropriate machinery for making decisions. It is not intended to provide a means whereby external influences — such as those of governments — may be applied to them. Once the appropriate machinery has been set up, it must be allowed to operate with the maximum degree of autonomy, especially in such vital areas as curriculum changes and faculty appointments. To deal with it otherwise is to endanger a

freedom that is not only precious in itself, but of vital importance to the health of our society.

The minister's praiseworthy behaviour in the O.C.A. crisis made it clear that he was sensitively aware of these matters and deeply concerned about the issues at stake. One can only wish that his sense of responsibility were shared by all."

The significance of the entire matter for the academic community should be recognized. It underlines the questions that confront universities and colleges as they become increasingly dependent on provincial governments, and therefore increasingly in need of the understanding, good will, and confident of the public at large. It gives fresh emphasis to the importance of the study of the relations between universities and governments that this Association began more than a year ago to attempt to establish.

J. Percy Smith,
Executive Secretary.

COPP

CANADIAN PARTY PLATFORMS 1867-1965

by Owen Carrigan

In the past eleven years, Canadians have gone to the polls five times, issues have become increasingly blurred and voters have tended to become apathetic. In the collation of official statements by the national parties of their plans and principles in every election since Confederation are reflected political trends and party fidelity to promises over the years. Thus, this book is an invaluable guide to those citizens who want to make an intelligent choice in another election as well as to the student of political history.

$13.85

CLARK

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE: A HANDBOOK OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS.

Edited by Louis Joughin.

University of Wisconsin Press, 1967, 343 pages. $7.50 U. S.

C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. members will appreciate the service to academic freedom in this country rendered by the production of *Academic Freedom and Tenure* by the American Association of University Professors. The handbook, as it is called, has been edited for the Association by Mr. Louis Joughin, its Associate Secretary. He has done more than merely edit an extensive collection of documents containing A.A.U.P. statements of principles, procedures, resolutions, advisory letters and articles relating to academic freedom. Chapter 2, a Model Case Procedure, was written for this volume and it consists of a step-by-step account of proceedings from the receipt of a complaint of a violation of academic freedom through formal investigation to report an action on it.

The "Model" is a useful summary for Canadian teachers who will find a number of differences in detail from the rather cryptic statement of procedure in the five paragraphs of the Introductory Note to the C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. *Policy Statement on Academic Appointments and Tenure* on pages 4-20 of the February 1968 *Bulletin*. Fortunately, the C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. Committee has had far fewer occasions to investigate complaints and its experience has not been extensive enough to permit the expression of its procedures in so detailed and systematic a fashion. The A.A.U.P. has had 3,000 complaints over the past fifty years. The resort to an ad hoc committee on the failure of attempts at mediation has not been necessary in Canada, although the *Policy Statement* provides for a special committee of enquiry that may be established jointly by the University and the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, or failing that, unilaterally by the Chairman of the Committee. So far the closest thing to a formal enquiry by the C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. has been that conducted by a special committee in the *Crowe* case (reported in a Special Issue of the *Bulletin* for January 1959), and more recently in the Simon Fraser investigation reported elsewhere in this issue. The latter case was not one of a violation of tenure but rather an enquiry into university government, and the procedure followed was largely experimental.

Perhaps the most formalized of the A.A.U.P. procedures is that involved in the publication of the report of an investigation and a possible vote of censure at the Annual Meeting. A list of Censured Administrations is reproduced on pages 143-46. The A.A.U.P. does not boycott a censured institution, although individual members may consider it their duty to refuse offered appointments. The Association does invite possible candidates for appointment to "seek information on present conditions of academic freedom and tenure" from the Washington Office. A similar position was taken by the C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. in the *Crowe* case and would be taken again if the conditions at a Canadian university or college warranted it.

In his explanation of the nature of the A.A.U.P.'s interest in academic welfare, Mr. Joughin points to two kinds of cases in which the A.A.U.P. "does not ordinarily exercise jurisdiction." These are first the "thousands of separations which occur each year as institutions or individuals decide that a nontenure relationship is not to be renewed at the conclusion of a contract period." The second is the "even more numerous" decisions not to promote or award an increase of salary. This denial of jurisdiction must be understood not to exclude complaints where a *prima facie* case of late notice or a violation of academic freedom is established. The C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee takes a rather more sympathetic view of non-renewal complaints. While it concedes that a non-renewal is not a dismissal, if the candidate was on probation the *Policy Statement* says clearly that probation "should imply that the university will give very serious consideration to . . . an appointment [with tenure]". The Committee will therefore look into a *bona fide* complaint to satisfy itself that "serious consideration" has, indeed, been given.

Curiously, the A.A.U.P. 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* recommends that "during the probationary period a teacher should have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have." Just how this freedom is to be protected if the Association does not stand by is not clear. Moreover, it appears to be the A.A.U.P.'s position that in denying a probationary candidate tenure the administration need not give reasons for the refusal to appoint. The C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. *Policy Statement* takes precisely the opposite position. If reasons are not given rumours may spread to the grave disadvantage of the candidate. Whether he wants to publicize the reasons should be his own affair. But he should be protected by his professional colleagues, at least by their insistence that he receive honest

consideration and that he be told the true reasons for his rejection. This limited protection may help to compel a better administrative decision.

The C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. Committee has long been unhappy about the inadequacy of the protection it has been able to offer a teacher on probation or serving a contract for a limited term. It is during these years that a teacher is at his most vulnerable. The lack of protection before tenure may mean that the teacher has to stifle valid criticism until he has served through the critical, formative years. When he has tenure the habit of "discretion" may be so deeply imbedded that his critical contributions may be silenced forever. The metamorphosis from a man to a sheep may be complete and irreversible.

The C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. Committee also inquires into refusal of promotion or increases of salary. The *Policy Statement* definition of "tenure" makes it clear that a person having tenure is entitled to "fair consideration for increases of responsibility and salary, and promotions in rank." There is little doubt that Canadian teachers may be "disciplined" in a discriminatory way for supporting unpopular political causes and similar manifestations of freedom and integrity. Harrassment that leads to resignation is no less a violation of academic freedom and tenure than unjustifiable dismissal.

Recently the C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. had to comment on the limitations on academic freedom asserted by Waterloo Lutheran University in the name of religion. (See the insert "Association News" in the February 1968 *Bulletin*.) The A.A.U.P. 1940 *Statement of Principles* implicitly tolerates this limitation, requiring only that "limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of appointment". The C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. *Policy Statement* holds that academic freedom "involves the right to teach, investigate, and speculate without deference to prescribed doctrine." The C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. does not suggest that a religious institution should not be entitled to teach according to its own religious convictions. Freedom of association surely includes the freedom to associate for limited freedom in teaching. But somehow the English language must find a word that refers to a place of genuine liberty, not liberty within the limits of dogma. I think it is not unreasonable to preserve "university" as that word.

A possible explanation of this difference between the A.A.U.P. *Statement of Principles* and the C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. *Policy* may be found

in the fact that the former *Statement* is a joint product of the A.A.U.P. and the Association of American Colleges. It took about six years to reach agreement. Undoubtedly the presence of representatives of the administration of church colleges must have led to some temporizing with basic principle. The C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. *Policy* is its own statement. If, someday, a joint statement by the C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. and the A.U.C.C. should emerge, and that statement, too, is a compromise, the Canadian academic community may be grateful that it has the C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. *Statement* in the background.

It is interesting to observe that the business of Committee A, the A.A.U.P. counterpart to the C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, has often involved Committee A in question of ethics and university government. The A.A.U.P. has a Committee B, on Professional Ethics, and the 1966 *Statement on Professional Ethics* is reproduced on pages 87-89. It also has a Committee T, on College and University Government. The 1966 *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities* is reproduced on page 90-101. The C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. Committee has had the same experience of inevitable overlap. Unfortunately there is no policy statement on ethics. There is, of course, Duff/Berdahl on *University Government in Canada,* and while that is not a C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. statement it serves a very useful role as a resource book on relevant problems and possible solutions. The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee now enjoys the jurisdiction originally shared by the two Committees on Faculty-Administration Relations, and where problems of university government emerge as a specific grievance, the Committee is ready to investigate them in the same way, so far as it is applicable, that it handles the complaints more specifically limited to violation of academic freedom or tenure.

A review, even a review article, is not the place to criticize at length the many statements of principles, or the accounts of procedures, set out in full in this valuable handbook. It must suffice to remark that the statements seem to be complete and comprehensive on every aspect of academic freedom and tenure. They appear in historical sequence from the 1940 *Statement* to the two *Statements* mentioned above, published in 1966. There are ten resolutions of Annual Meetings and excerpts from seventeen advisory letters. In writing letters, Executive Secretaries have to exercise tremendous restraint. In the summer of 1963 one letter said, "Certainly a faculty member should not have to give evidence of 'cheerful . . . performance of assigned duties' in order

to be considered loyal. This is too much." Thank God reviewers can be less restrained. They can say, "This is much too much, dammit".

In addition to these very useful documents on the A.A.U.P.'s position, a series of seven Appendices provides added incentive to any Canadian teacher to buy a copy of this handbook to put on his shelf next to *A Place of Liberty,* the Duff/Berdahl *Report* and his bound copies of the C.A.U.T./A.C.P.U. *Bulletin.* Between pages 155 and 338 there are reproduced the *1915 Declaration of Principles* and articles on academic freedom by Professor Fritz Machlup (1955 and 1964) Professor Clark Byse and Louis Joughin (1959), Professor Howard Mumford Jones (1960), Professor Ralph F. Fuchs (1963) and another by Louis Joughin alone (1963).

It is to be hoped that the availability of these articles and the extensive documentation may inspire critical writing on academic freedom in Canada in the pages of this *Bulletin.*

J. B. Milner.

mémoire de l'Association canadienne des professeurs d'université à la Commission d'étude Munroe sur les statistiques de l'éducation du Bureau fédéral de la statistique

mémoire rédigé par Mireille Lapointe,
chargé de recherches au secrétariat de l'A.C.P.U.

d'Ottawa, ce vingt-deux décembre mille neuf cent soixante-sept.

I. *Préambule*

En plusieurs occasions, l'Association canadienne des professeurs d'université, lors de rencontres, de réunions ou par courrier manifeste son intérêt et la nécessité d'améliorer la qualité et la quantité de l'information statistique de la division de l'éducation du Bureau fédéral de la statistique. L'Association est l'un des « consommateurs » de ces régimes statistiques, en particulier les enquêtes annuelles et biennales sur le traitement et les qualités des professeurs, celles sur le financement de l'enseignement supérieur et les inscriptions d'étudiants dans les universités du Canada.

Nous soumettons d'abord des commentaires généraux, un résumé de nos recommandations et en appendice du mémoire nous recommandons l'établissement de nouveaux régimes statistiques ou l'amélioration de régimes existants. Ces régimes statistiques sont les suivants :

appendice A — enquête sur les professeurs et les universitaires engagés dans la recherche à temps complet;

appendice B — enquête sur le financement de l'enseignement supérieur;

appendice C — enquête sur le financement de la recherche dans les institutions d'enseignement supérieur;

appendice D — enquête sur les avantages sociaux offerts aux professeurs des institutions d'enseignement supérieur au Canada.

II. *Commentaires généraux*

1. Publication des renseignements statistiques

Le catalogue des publications de la division de l'éducation du B.F.S., indique le retard de plusieurs années dans la publication des renseignements statistiques. Vu le retard, leur fonction est réduite, tout au plus devient-elle historique. Si les retards persistent, les organismes qui utilisent ces renseignements statistiques seront forcés de chercher des moyens plus efficaces de se les procurer. L'A.C.P.U. n'oublie pourtant pas les services que lui rend depuis nombre d'années la section de l'enseignement supérieur du B.F.S. Nous recevons annuellement, dès que disponibles, les données sur les échelles de traitements, selon le rang les traitements médians de dix-neuf institutions d'enseignement supérieur, selon le rang et l'université le traitement moyen, le 1er décile et le 9^{e} décile. Avec une certaine appréhension nous attendons les conséquences du départ de monsieur Ralph Mitchener de la direction de la section de l'enseignement supérieur, conséquences qui affecteraient peut-être la qualité et la rapidité des services nombreux qu'il nous rend encore cette année.

2. Personnel de la division de l'éducation du B.F.S.

Quelles que soient les pressions exercées auprès des autorités du B.F.S. pour établir ou améliorer les régimes statistiques, tout effort s'avère inutile tant que la division ne réussira pas à recruter les candidats aux nombreux postes actuellement vacants. Le problème du recrutement du personnel a atteint au cours des derniers mois une dimension alarmante : nous incitons les autorités du B.F.S. à mettre en œuvre les mesures nécessaires pour résoudre cet urgent problème.

3. Validité et précision des renseignements statistiques

En plusieurs occasions, lors de nos réunions du conseil, lors de communications téléphoniques, lors de la consultation de documents d'enquête ou de mémoires sur les traitements des professeurs, les chiffres fournis par le B.F.S. ne coïncident pas toujours avec ceux d'autres sources d'information en la matière. Que l'université ait soumis une déclaration erronée, qu'elle ait faussement interprété la classification, que les données correspondent à une déclaration à des dates différentes, il n'en demeure pas moins vrai que le B.F.S. doit mettre en œuvre tous les mécanismes nécessaires à une déclaration statistique la plus complète et la plus précise possible.

4. Universalité de la déclaration statistique

Citons comme exemple l'enquête annuelle sur le traitement médian des professeurs. Ces renseignements ne portent que sur dix-neuf institutions d'enseignement supérieur. L'échantillon n'a qu'une valeur purement historique. Il est fortement recommandé que le B.F.S. s'emploie à assurer annuellement une déclaration complète de toutes les institutions d'enseignement supérieur plutôt que de se limiter à un échantillon qui en plus n'est même pas stratifié.

5. Comparaison entre les provinces et les niveaux d'étude

Dans l'ensemble du Canada, les institutions d'enseignement supérieur et les institutions pré-universitaires (collégiales) ne sont pas totalement identiques. Il est essentiel que les régimes statistiques portant sur différents types d'institutions fournissent des chiffres assez détaillés qui permettent par la suite des comparaisons plus valables entre les provinces. Illustrons : si l'on s'intéresse au nombre d'étudiants au-delà de la 13^{e} année ou de la 14^{e} année d'étude à travers le Canada, dans certaines provinces, comme Terre-Neuve, la plupart de ces étudiants sont inscrits à l'université alors qu'au Québec l'inscription sera comptée parmi les étudiants des universités et des C.E.G.E.P. : si l'on veut calculer le coût de l'enseignement pour ce même groupe d'étudiants, il faudra consulter plus d'un rapport statistique et tenter d'établir des équivalences. On peut également n'être intéressé qu'au coût de l'enseignement post-secondaire à l'université comme telle. La coordination des divers régimes statistiques devient essentielle pour permettre des regroupements de niveaux comparables d'une province à l'autre. De plus les divers régimes statistiques portant sur les mêmes institutions d'enseignement (v.g. le financement des universités, les étudiants des universités, les professeurs des universités) doivent être établis en parallèle, i.e. la classification d'un régime correspondant à la classification d'un autre régime, quel que soit le domaine du même niveau d'étude.

6. Établissement de comités consultatifs

Nous recommandons l'établissement très prochain de comités consultatifs dans les domaines de l'enseignement élémentaire, de l'enseignement secondaire, de l'enseignement supérieur, du financement de l'enseignement aux divers niveaux d'étude, de l'enseignement des adultes, etc. Ces comités consultatifs seraient constitués de fonctionnaires responsables du B.F.S. et de délégués d'organismes qui sont les principaux « consommateurs » des statistiques de l'enseignement. Les comités auraient entre

autre pour fonction de discuter avec les autorités compétentes et de leur communiquer la nature de leurs besoins d'ordre statistique. Lors de la formation de tels comités consultatifs, l'A.C.P.U. devra siéger à chacun des comités du domaine de l'enseignement supérieur.

III. *Recommandations*

L'Association canadienne des professeurs d'université recommande :

1) que le Bureau fédéral de la statistique s'emploie de toute urgence à éliminer les retards de publication des renseignements statistiques;

2) que le Bureau fédéral de la statistique applique les mesures nécessaires pour recruter des candidats qualifiés aux postes vacants de la division de l'éducation;

3) que le Bureau fédéral de la statistique obtienne du gouvernement fédéral les sommes nécessaires pour permettre l'établissement de nouveaux régimes statistiques ou l'amélioration de régimes existants afin de répondre plus adéquatement aux besoins nombreux du domaine des statistiques de l'éducation;

4) que le Bureau fédéral de la statistique veille à établir des méthodes sûres de vérification de l'information statistique et à définir avec précision et clarté les classes et les rubriques de chacune des classifications;

5) que le Bureau fédéral de la statistique maintienne des relations constantes avec les organismes et les institutions à qui importe le devoir de soumettre les renseignements statistiques, ceci en vue d'assurer la déclaration la plus complète possible;

6) que les régimes statistiques de la division de l'éducation soient conçus pour répondre à des besoins multi-fonctionnels, i.e. que soit rendue possible la comparaison entre les différents niveaux des statistiques de l'éducation et entre les régimes parallèles des statistiques de l'éducation;

7) 1. que de toute nécessité le Bureau fédéral de la statistique prenne l'initiative de procéder à l'établissement de comités consultatifs composés de fonctionnaires responsables du B.F.S. et de délégués d'organismes « consommateurs » des renseignements statistiques;

2. que l'A.C.P.U. siège à chacun des comités consultatifs du domaine de l'enseignement supérieur;

8) que le Bureau fédéral de la statistique s'emploie à créer un régime statistique sur les subventions à la recherche dans les institutions d'enseignement supérieur conforme aux aspects mentionnés à l'appendice « C » de ce mémoire;

9) que le Bureau fédéral de la statistique s'emploie, de concert avec l'A.C.P.U., à développer un régime multiple de statistiques dans le secteur des avantages sociaux offerts aux professeurs des institutions d'enseignement supérieur, tel que résumé à l'appendice « D » de ce mémoire;

10) que le Bureau fédéral de la statistique effectue *annuellement* l'enquête biennale sur les professeurs; qu'il modifie l'enquête biennale actuelle en conformité aux recommandations de l'appendice « A » de ce mémoire;

11) que le Bureau fédéral de la statistique améliore le régime statistique sur le financement de l'enseignement supérieur à la lumière des recommandations de l'appendice « B ».

APPENDICE A

ENQUÊTE ANNUELLE SUR LES PROFESSEURS

Les renseignements requis dans cette enquête demandent l'obtention d'une information sur chacun des professeurs et des personnes engagées pour la recherche (sans enseignement) dans les universités.

I. Une partie des données statistiques sont déclarées annuellement comme par exemple le traitement.

II. D'autres renseignements ne sont fournis qu'une fois durant la carrière du professeur tels la date de naissance, le pays d'origine, le sexe. Cela suppose l'établissement d'une « banque » de renseignements sur chacun des professeurs rendant possible l'analyse de la carrière sous différents angles dont la promotion, l'influence de certains grades universitaires, la mobilité, le recrutement, l'abandon.

III. Quelques renseignements déjà accumulés doivent être vérifiés annuellement et s'ajouter s'il y a lieu. Illustrons ce genre d'information : le rang, l'université, l'état civil, les derniers grades universitaires.

IV. En dernier lieu, le groupe de renseignements sur l'université même n'est déclaré annuellement qu'une fois à chacune des universités dont par exemple l'inscription, le traitement minimal selon le rang.

Voici la liste des renseignements de l'enquête sur les professeurs :

A — *renseignements sur l'université;*

B — *renseignements sur chacun des professeurs et des personnes engagées dans la recherche seulement.*

A — renseignements sur l'université

1. l'université

— l'on ne doit considérer comme université que les institutions d'une province qui sont considérées comme universités par le gouvernement de cette province;

— lorsqu'une université a des collèges affiliés, il faut distinguer entre l'université et chacun de ses collèges affiliés.

2. la province	
3. la taille de l'université	— établir un nouveau regroupement des universités en tenant compte des inscriptions totales d'étudiants réguliers à temps complet à tous les niveaux, des inscriptions au premier cycle d'étude et des inscriptions au deuxième et troisième cycles d'étude; — le regroupement des universités doit permettre d'établir des groupes entre les institutions de 7,500 étudiants, de 10,000, de 15,000, de 20,000 et celles de plus de 20,000 étudiants lorsqu'il y aura lieu.
4. l'âge de l'université	— certaines institutions deviennent à un moment de leur histoire une université. L'âge de l'université se calcule par rapport à la date à laquelle l'institution devient une université indépendante et non par rapport à la date de fondation de l'établissement.
5. l'universalité	— toutes les institutions doivent participer à la déclaration statistique plutôt qu'une déclaration sur la base d'un échantillon même stratifié.
6. le nombre des professeurs	— le nombre selon le rang doit inclure tous les professeurs engagés à temps complet, qu'ils soient laïcs ou religieux. L'on doit également obtenir le nombre de professeurs à temps partiel et celui des assistants à l'enseignement (teaching assistants).
7. le nombre de personnes engagées dans la recherche (sans enseignement)	— certaines universités engagent à temps complet un personnel uniquement pour la recherche. Le recensement de cette population devrait tenir compte du statut de ces personnes dont par exemple distinguer entre l'universitaire et le chargé de recherches.

8. le traitement minimal et maximal des professeurs à temps complet	— on devra indiquer à chaque institution la durée de la période d'engagement : est-elle de 9, 10, 11 ou de 12 mois ?
9. le traitement des professeurs à temps partiel	— l'université devrait fournir des renseignements sur le taux de rémunération des professeurs à temps partiel, des professeurs enseignant aux cours du soir et aux cours d'été;
10. la rémunération supplémentaire au-delà de la durée de la période d'engagement	— dans le cas d'une université où la durée de la période d'engagement est de 9 mois, par exemple, quel taux de rémunération supplémentaire ou quelle somme supplémentaire verse-t-elle aux professeurs qui demeurent à l'université au-delà de cette période ?

B — renseignements sur chacun des professeurs et des personnes engagées dans la recherche seulement (à temps complet)

1. le nom ou le numéro d'assurance sociale	— le nom ou le numéro d'assurance sociale permettra d'identifier la personne durant sa carrière à quelqu'université qu'elle soit. — suivre l'individu dans sa carrière permet une analyse de la structure des traitements beaucoup plus complète et plus valable que l'étude des seules coupes instantanées où la composition de la population peut, sans contrôle possible, varier sensiblement d'une période à l'autre.
2. l'université, la faculté ou l'école, le département ou la section de la faculté ou de l'école	— dans la situation d'un double engagement, indiquer la ou les deux faculté(s) ou école(s), le ou les deux département(s). — double engagement s'applique à la situation d'un professeur, membre du corps professoral de plus d'un département ou d'une faculté. Double engagement

ne signifie pas nécessairement que le professeur enseigne aussi à d'autres facultés ou départements;

— l'on sait déjà par des enquêtes effectuées dans d'autres secteurs de l'emploi hors des universités qu'existent des différences de rémunération entre les spécialistes de disciplines connexes (v.g. les ingénieurs entre eux selon la spécialité; entre les chimistes, les biologistes et les physiciens) qui à l'université sont groupés à la même faculté. Entre les universités mêmes, la classification des départements par faculté ne se compare pas dans tous les cas.

3. la discipline

— le département indique la classification administrative; la discipline indique la spécialisation du professeur;

— la classification selon la discipline doit être plus détaillée afin de rendre possible par la suite des regroupements multi-fonctionnels. Si on analyse par exemple le traitement des biologistes sous l'angle de leurs qualités, de leur promotion, de leur expérience, il est important de pousser l'analyse jusqu'à comparer les biologistes entre les facultés : médecine, sciences, école des infirmières;

— de plus, seule « l'étiquette » du département n'indique pas nécessairement la discipline de l'individu : un biochimiste peut être membre du département de biologie ou de chimie, un chimiste, membre du département de chimie, de biochimie ou de biologie.

4. le sexe

5. l'état civil :
célibataire, marié(e), divorcé(e), séparé(e), veuf (veuve)

6. le statut social : laïc (laïque), religieux (religieuse)	
7. la date de naissance et le pays d'origine	— pour établir avec exactitude l'âge des professeurs, il est essentiel de connaître la date de naissance; — sur l'ensemble des professeurs, lorsqu'on les regroupe par groupe d'âges, les erreurs possibles provenant de la seule information sur l'année de naissance se compensent les unes, les autres. Mais les faibles populations, par exemple la comparaison de l'âge des économistes entre les universités, ne permettent pas d'annuler aussi automatiquement ces erreurs.
8. les qualités : grades, diplômes selon l'année de l'obtention, l'université et le pays où se situe l'université	— il s'agit de dresser la liste complète de tous les grades et des diplômes obtenus; — jusqu'à maintenant l'enquête biennale du Bureau fédéral de la statistique ne renseigne que sur le premier grade universitaire et le dernier. — par exemple, certaines hypothèses, non vérifiées, porteraient à croire que la promotion et le niveau du traitement seraient différents pour l'individu qui commence sa carrière après une maîtrise et obtient un doctorat quelques années plus tard et pour celui qui entre dans la carrière après un doctorat. L'on pourrait indiquer d'autres types d'analyse que permettrait cette variable.
9. le rang : titulaire, agrégé, adjoint, chargé d'enseignement, rang inférieur à celui de chargé d'enseignement, autres	— il faudrait aussi classifier parallèlement les universitaires engagés à l'université pour la recherche seulement.

10. le traitement

— il s'agit d'indiquer le traitement annuel de base, i.e. excluant toute rémunération supplémentaire; il faudrait préciser la durée de la période d'engagement (9, 10, 11 ou 12 mois);
— si le professeur est engagé pour une période de 9 mois, par exemple, qu'il reçoit une rémunération supplémentaire pour demeurer à l'université au-delà de la période de 9 mois, cette rémunération supplémentaire ne doit pas s'ajouter à son traitement de base;
— par contre, le professeur qui, parce que directeur d'un département ou doyen, reçoit un supplément pour la tâche administrative, ce supplément doit s'ajouter à son traitement de base. L'on doit aussi connaître le montant de ce supplément.

11. la nature des tâches

— il s'agit de distinguer entre les professeurs et les universitaires engagés seulement dans la recherche, entre les professeurs et ceux qui remplissent une tâche administrative, entre les professeurs qui n'enseignent qu'au niveau du premier cycle d'étude et ceux qui enseignent aussi aux autres niveaux d'étude.

12. le degré de l'enseignement : 1er cycle, 2e cycle, 3e cycle

— ce n'est qu'une hypothèse, elle mérite toutefois d'être vérifiée : quelle influence exerce sur la structure des traitements le niveau des cycles d'étude offerts à un département. Le fait d'offrir des cycles de cours à plus d'un niveau influe-t-il sur le niveau même des traitements à ce département ?

13. l'occupation antérieure : poste antérieur, traitement annuel de base la dernière année à ce poste, secteur de l'emploi, situation géographique de l'emploi

— secteur de l'emploi :
  i) université
  ii) centre de recherche
  iii) gouvernement
  iv) propre employeur
  v) industrie

vi) étudiant
vii) autres

— situation géographique de l'emploi :

i) pays
ii) province
iii) ville

14. la nomination à cette université : rang et traitement à la nomination

15. le départ de l'université : vers quel secteur de l'emploi, le traitement annuel de base au nouveau poste, localisation géographique du nouveau poste

— secteur de l'emploi :

i) université
ii) centre de recherche
iii) gouvernement
iv) propre employeur
v) industrie
vi) étudiant
vii) décès
viii) maladie
ix) autres

— situation géographique du nouvel emploi :

i) pays
ii) province
iii) ville

APPENDICE B

ENQUÊTE SUR LE FINANCEMENT DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR

En matière de financement des institutions d'enseignement supérieur, nous formulerons des recommandations en tenant compte du régime existant. Nos commentaires porteront sur le régime actuel et les modifications essentielles à y apporter :

I. *régime actuel* [1] :
   - A) définition des rubriques;
   - B) terminologie française;
   - C) estimations et cohérence du rapport statistique.

II. *modification du régime actuel* :
   - A) classe d'institutions;
   - B) regroupement des institutions;
   - C) réorganisation et addition de rubriques aux postes « revenus » et « dépenses » (fonctionnement, recherche subventionnée et investissement).

I. RÉGIME ACTUEL

A) définition des rubriques —

Un examen même rapide des renseignements sur le financement de l'enseignement supérieur fait naître des doutes quant à la valeur réelle de ces données statistiques. Juger de la validité de cette information suppose une connaissance de la qualité de la classification, du procédé de l'enquête, de l'exactitude et de la vérification de la déclaration, etc. Nous n'aborderons que l'aspect qualité de la classification par l'examen de la définition des rubriques. A l'appendice du rapport se trouve la définition des catégories de l'enquête. Quelques exemples de définitions ambiguës suffiront à illustrer le besoin de re-définir les rubriques avec plus de clarté et de précision.

[1] Universités canadiennes, recettes et dépenses, 1964-1965, Bureau fédéral de la statistique, Division de l'éducation, Section des finances, Ottawa, novembre 1967, nº 81-212.

— exemple 1 : « directive [2] », (dépenses d'exploitation [3]) — Ce poste comprend entre autre les traitements du personnel enseignant et administratif. La définition ne précise pas si le traitement du personnel auxiliaire (commis, secrétaires, etc.) apparaît ou non à cette rubrique. L'expression « personnel administratif » désigne-t-elle uniquement le personnel de classe professionnelle ? Les chercheurs affectés uniquement à des travaux de recherche sont-ils inclus sous cette rubrique ?

— exemple 2 : « administration [4] » — Selon la définition et l'énumération des postes, la rubrique « administration » inclut les traitements et les dépenses du personnel administratif de classe professionnelle. Cette rubrique porte-t-elle sur le traitement du personnel auxiliaire ? Sinon, à quel poste cette dépense est-elle affectée ?

— exemple 3 : « recherche patronnée [5] », (dépenses d'exploitation) — La définition indique que ces dépenses de recherche sont financées à même les subventions de l'extérieur. Mais selon la provenance des subventions de recherche, on indique nulle part s'il s'agit de subventions individuelles aux chercheurs ou de subventions générales de recherches octroyées à l'université ou s'il s'agit des deux à la fois.

— exemple 4 : « contribution des fondations [6] », (revenu d'administration) — La définition vague du terme « fondation » ne précise pas si les fondations du gouvernement fédéral (Conseil national de recherches, Conseil des recherches médicales, Conseil des Arts du Canada) sont comprises à ce poste

[2] directive : inclure toutes les dépenses ordinaires des départements scolaires, soit : traitements, salaires, fournitures, équipement, papeteries, blanchissage, frais de déplacement et contributions de l'établissement à des fonds de retraite, régimes d'assurance collective et autres prestations pour le personnel enseignant et administratif. (p. 57)

[3] nous examinerons plus loin les fautes de terminologie française.

[4] administration : comprend les traitements et dépenses du personnel administratif (président, contrôleur, secrétaire, comptable, vérificateur interne, acheteur ou économe, agent du personnel, etc.). (p. 58)

[5] recherche patronnée : comprend toutes les dépenses de recherche financées entièrement à même les sources indiquées comme revenus sous « recherche patronnée ». Les montants indiqués comme dépenses de la recherche patronnée sont identiques aux revenus réels de la recherche patronnée. Le total indiqué comme revenus de la recherche patronnée est le total des dépenses provenant des divers genres de fonds plutôt que les fonds reçus durant l'année. La recherche payée à même les propres fonds d'une institution est incluse dans « enseignement ». (p. 57)

[6] contribution des fondations : comprennent les montants provenant des fonds reçus des fondations et autres organismes de charité ou à but non lucratif non inclus dans (contributions des sociétés) (3) ci-dessus. (p. 56)

ou à la rubrique « subventions gouvernementales fédérales ». Le lecteur n'obtient cette précision qu'après consultation de l'introduction du rapport.

B) terminologie française —

La terminologie française de ce régime est inadéquate. Elle confond par l'emploi du même terme des réalités nettement distinctes (v.g. « administration » traduit « operating income » et « administration »). Certains concepts bien identifiés dans la terminologie anglaise apparaissent en français sous une étiquette qui ne fait aucunement appel à la réalité à identifier (v.g. « directive » est traduit à partir du terme anglais « instruction ». Nous ne citerons que l'exemple de termes erronés ou équivoques; nous passerons outre le relevé de certaines expressions douteuses, incorrectes ou guère élégantes.

expressions du rapport	expressions anglaises	expressions suggérées
revenu d'administration	operating income	revenu de fonctionnement
revenu de capital	capital income	source du fonds d'investissement
dépense d'exploitation	operating expenditure	dépense de fonctionnement
directive	instruction	enseignement
dépense d'administration extraordinaire	extraordinary operating expenditure	dépense extraordinaire de fonctionnement
dépense de capital	capital expenditure	affectation du fonds d'investissement
terrains et immeubles	land and buildings	immeubles
immeuble	building	édifice

C) estimations et cohérence de l'information statistique —

Quelques paragraphes de l'introduction du rapport sur le financement de l'enseignement supérieur indiquent le calcul d'estimations pour suppléer au manque de renseignements statistiques d'un certain nombre d'institutions. Est-il besoin de répéter que la déclaration statistique doit être la plus complète possible.

Dans la situation d'un manque de renseignements d'un quelconque secteur de la déclaration, l'estimation a peut-être le mérite de fournir une image plus voisine de la réalité. Encore faut-il que les hypothèses à la base de l'estimation soient réalistes. Jusqu'à maintenant le critère de ces hypothèses est déterminé selon les revenus et les dépenses par étudiant à temps complet. L'indice « revenu par étudiant » ou l'indice « dépense par étudiant » fourniraient peut-être une base valable d'estimation si, au lieu de ne compter que le nombre d'étudiants à temps complet, on pondérait ce nombre en tenant relativement compte aussi des autres étudiants dont les étudiants réguliers à temps partiel, les étudiants en rédaction de thèse, les étudiants non réguliers inscrits aux cours du soir ou aux cours d'été, etc.

Le dernier rapport, celui de 1964-1965, manque d'une certaine cohérence parce que les chiffres des recettes et des dépenses de fonctionnement sont augmentés des estimations à ces postes alors qu'aux rubriques de la section « affectation du fonds d'investissement », ces chiffres correspondent à la déclaration sans l'addition d'aucune estimation. Pour résoudre cette difficulté et permettre une comparaison plus valable des coûts de fonctionnement et d'investissement, l'on devrait présenter des tableaux sur le montant des estimations à chacune des rubriques.

II. MODIFICATION DU RÉGIME ACTUEL

A) classes d'institutions —

Le régime statistique actuel sur le financement de l'enseignement supérieur porte sur les universités et d'autres établissements que l'on ne peut qualifier d'universités. Tel que défini à la page 8 du rapport, on considère comme établissement d'enseignement supérieur « toute université ou tout collège qui offre au moins une année d'étude en vue d'un diplôme au-delà de la dernière année du cours secondaire dans la province où ils sont situés. »

Comme nous le mentionnons dans la partie de ce mémoire intitulée « commentaires généraux », article 5, ce régime statistique, comme les autres du domaine de l'éducation, devrait être suffisamment

détaillé pour que les données sur les universités soient indépendantes plutôt que groupées avec celles d'autres types d'institutions qui ne sont pas comme telles des universités.

Comme nous le suggérons à l'appendice « A » de ce mémoire (page 92), l'on ne doit considérer comme universités que les institutions d'une province qui sont considérées comme universités par le gouvernement de cette province.

Notre recommandation ne cherche pas à éliminer de la déclaration les établissements qui offrent quelques années d'étude au niveau de l'enseignement supérieur; nous proposons plutôt (s'inspirant de la recommandation 6 de ce mémoire) que les régimes statistiques ... soient conçus en vue de répondre à des besoins multi-fonctionnels, que soit rendue possible la comparaison entre les différents niveaux des statistiques de l'éducation et entre les régimes parallèles des statistiques de l'éducation.

B) regroupement des universités —

1. par province;
2. par région :
    a) Atlantique;
    b) Québec;
    c) Ontario;
    d) ouest;
3. selon l'importance des dépenses annuelles de fonctionnement :
    — jusqu'à maintenant une seule classe groupe les institutions dont les dépenses de fonctionnement dépassent 5 millions;

— le regroupement des institutions selon les dépenses de fonctionnement doit permettre d'établir les groupes suivants :

a) dépenses de fonctionnement de moins de 2.5 millions;
b) dépenses de fonctionnement entre 2.5 et 5 millions;
c) dépenses de fonctionnement entre 5 et 10 millions;
d) dépenses de fonctionnement entre 10 et 15 millions;
e) dépenses de fonctionnement entre 15 et 20 millions;
f) dépenses de fonctionnement de 20 millions et plus.

C) réorganisation et addition de rubriques aux postes « revenus » et « dépenses » (fonctionnement, recherche subventionnée, investissement)

1. revenus de fonctionnement (excluant la recherche subventionnée);
2. source des fonds de la recherche subventionnée (excluant les subventions à l'achat d'appareils);
3. source du fonds d'investissement;
4. dépenses de fonctionnement;
5. affectation du fonds d'investissement.

(les rubriques de ces cinq secteurs sont énumérées aux pages suivantes)

1. *revenus de fonctionnement* (excluant la recherche subventionnée)
   a) frais de scolarité :
      i) acquittés par l'étudiant;
      ii) acquittés par une bourse
         — gouvernement fédéral;

— gouvernement provincial;
— université;
— autres;

b) subventions gouvernementales :

i) gouvernement fédéral (excluant les subventions du C.N.R., C.R.M., C.A.C.[7]) selon les ministères;

ii) gouvernement provincial — ministère de l'éducation;
— autres ministères;

iii) gouvernement municipal;

c) sociétés;

d) fondations :

i) publiques (gouvernementales) — du Canada — gouvernement fédéral;
— gouvernement provincial;
— autres;
— de l'étranger;

ii) privées — du Canada;
— de l'étranger;

e) organismes religieux;

f) gradués et diplômés;

[7] Conseil national de recherches, Conseil des recherches médicales, Conseil des Arts du Canada.

g) autres dons;

h) dotations;

i) autres;

j) entreprises auxiliaires.

2. *source des fonds de la recherche subventionnée* (excluant les subventions à l'achat d'appareils)

a) subventions individuelles aux chercheurs :

i) gouvernements — fédéral (excluant les subventions du C.N.R., C.R.M., C.A.C.) selon les ministères;
— provincial selon les ministères;
— municipal;

ii) sociétés;

iii) fondations — publiques — du Canada — gouvernement fédéral;
— gouvernement provincial;
— autres;
— de l'étranger;
— privées — du Canada;
— de l'étranger;

iv) organismes religieux;

v) gradués et diplômés;

vi) autres subventions;

vii) dotations;

viii) autres;

b) subventions générales de recherches octroyées à l'université :

i) gouvernements — fédéral (excluant les subventions du C.N.R., C.R.M., C.A.C.) selon les ministères;
— provincial; selon les ministères;
— municipal;

ii) sociétés;

iii) fondations — publiques — du Canada — gouvernement fédéral;
— gouvernement provincial;
— autres;
— de l'étranger;
— privées — du Canada;
— de l'étranger;

iv) organismes religieux;

v) gradués et diplômés;

vi) autres subventions;

vii) dotations;

viii) autres.

3. *source du fonds d'investissement* (incl. subventions à l'achat d'appareils de recherche et aux bibliothèques)

a) gouvernements :

i) gouvernement fédéral (excluant C.N.R., C.R.M., C.A.C.) selon les ministères;

ii) gouvernement provincial — ministère de l'éducation;
— autres ministères;

iii) gouvernement municipal;

b) sociétés;

c) fondations :

i) publiques — du Canada — gouvernement fédéral;
— gouvernement provincial;
— autres;

— de l'étranger;

ii) privées — du Canada;

— de l'étranger;

d) organismes religieux;

e) gradués et diplômés;

f) souscriptions publiques;

g) revenu du fonds d'immobilisation;

h) apports moins sorties;

i) bénéfices du retrait de fonds d'immobilisation;

j) emprunts à long terme;

k) autres.

4. *dépenses de fonctionnement* (excl. l'achat d'appareils de recherche, l'achat de volumes et la souscription à des périodiques)

a) enseignement selon la faculté :

i) traitements et avantages sociaux du personnel enseignant;

ii) traitements et avantages sociaux du personnel auxiliaire;

iii) autres dépenses;

b) bibliothèque :

i) traitements et avantages sociaux du personnel affecté au service de la bibliothèque;

ii) autres (excluant l'achat de volumes et la souscription à des périodiques);

c) recherche selon la faculté (incluant la recherche subventionnée) :

i) traitements et avantages sociaux du personnel affecté uniquement à la recherche;

ii) autres (excluant l'achat d'appareils de recherche);

d) administration :

i) traitements et avantages sociaux du personnel professionnel affecté à l'administration générale de l'université;

ii) traitements et avantages sociaux du personnel auxiliaire affecté à l'administration générale de l'université;

iii) autres;

e) gradués et diplômés;

f) entretien;

g) bourses selon le niveau d'étude :

i) 1er cycle;

ii) 2^{e} cycle;

iii) 3^{e} cycle;

h) divers;

i) dépenses extraordinaires de fonctionnement;

j) entreprises auxiliaires.

5. *affectation du fonds d'investissement* (incluant l'achat d'appareils de recherche, l'achat de volumes et la souscription à des périodiques pour la bibliothèque)

a) immeubles :

i) terrains;

ii) édifices;

b) ameublement et contenu des édifices (excluant l'achat d'appareils de recherche, l'achat de volumes et la souscription à des périodiques pour la bibliothèque);

c) appareils de recherche;

d) bibliothèque (achat de volumes et souscription à des périodiques);

e) remboursement d'emprunts (capital et intérêt);

f) perte du retrait de fonds d'immobilisation;

g) autres.

APPENDICE C

ENQUÊTE ANNUELLE SUR LE FINANCEMENT DE LA RECHERCHE DANS LES INSTITUTIONS D'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR

1. l'université, la faculté, le département, le centre de recherche (s'il y a lieu)
2. la province
3. la discipline
4. le montant de la subvention
5. la source de la subvention :

    a) subvention du Canada :

        gouvernement fédéral selon le ministère ou l'organisme gouvernemental (excl. les fondations gouvernementales)

        gouvernement provincial selon le ministère ou l'organisme gouvernemental et la province (excl. les fondations gouvernementales)

        fondations gouvernementales (indiquer laquelle)

        fondations privées (indiquer laquelle)

        industries

        autres

    b) subvention étrangère : (indiquer le pays)

        gouvernement selon le ministère ou l'organisme gouvernemental (excl. les fondations gouvernementales)

        fondations gouvernementales (indiquer laquelle)

        fondations privées (indiquer laquelle)

        industries

        autres

c) subvention à même le fonds de fonctionnement de l'université

6. les fins de la subvention :
   les travaux de recherche
   l'achat d'appareils de recherche : moins de $5,000; de $5,000 à $9,999; de $10,000 à $19,999; $20,000 et plus
   la location d'appareils de recherche
   le fonctionnement d'appareils de recherche
   la construction (v.g. de laboratoires)
   autres
7. la durée de la recherche : à court terme (moins de 4 mois); à long terme (4 mois et plus)
8. le genre de recherche :
   recherche libre subventionnée
   contrat de recherche

APPENDICE D

ENQUÊTE ANNUELLE SUR LES AVANTAGES SOCIAUX OFFERTS AUX PROFESSEURS DES INSTITUTIONS D'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR

L'enquête annuelle à chaque institution d'enseignement supérieur doit porter sur les avantages sociaux suivants :

1. le régime de caisse de retraite
2. le régime d'assurance-vie
3. le régime provincial d'assurance-hospitalisation
4. le régime d'assurance-hospitalisation complémentaire au régime provincial
5. le régime de congé de maladie avec rémunération
6. le régime de l'assurance médico-chirurgicale
7. le régime d'indemnité par suite d'incapacité
8. le régime de congé sabbatique
9. le régime de réduction des frais de scolarité pour les enfants des professeurs
10. le régime de prêts et de garantie de prêt aux professeurs (hypothèques et autres)
11. le logement des professeurs
12. le régime de subvention de la recherche durant l'été

BOOK REVIEWS — NOTES DE LECTURE

THE UNIVERSITY GAME

Edited by Adelman and Lee. Anansi, Toronto, 1968.

According to the editors, this volume was prepared for persons who are able to recognize that a very great deal of what goes on in the university today has very little to do with education and who have sufficient strength of mind in the face of this unfortunate state of affairs to re-open the basic questions, "What is a university?" and "What is wisdom?"

The editors also tell us that the pieces published here were selected not because they offered any solutions (for none appears available at the moment) and certainly not because the conclusions expressed by the authors agreed with those of the editors. Rather, the sole criterion of selection was "whether the authors manifested a post-rebellious strength of mind and nerve". Such a novel criterion for the exercise of editorial judgment has produced a work which is both stimulating and irritating, sometimes disappointing but seldom dull. As might be expected, more is promised than is delivered; but on the whole the book presents a largely successful attempt to engage in serious analysis of many of the basic issues confronting the contemporary university.

Getting to Rochdale by Dennis Lee, one of the co-editors of the volume, is at once an account of the foundation of Rochdale College, an experimental "free" university of sorts, and a moving personal testimony to one man's dis-affection from the contemporary multiversity. Although Mr. Lee is considerably more certain of what it is he is against than of what he is for, his essay gives an excellent portrait of the basic inadequacies of the large urban university as seen through the eyes of a sensitive and mature student.

In the same vein, but much less successful, is the essay by the other co-editor of the volume and fellow founder of Rochdale College, Howard Adelman. Entitled *In Search of the University*, Adelman's essay attempts too much. Ranging over the history of the universities in his search, he betrays an unsure grasp of his material and a shrillness of tone which detract from the good points he does make.

John Seeley's two pieces on Berkeley, the one previously published some time ago and the other related in a rather contrived way to the Canadian scene, do not add any luster to their author's academic reputation. Here too, the shrillness of tone is distractingly offensive. However, the reviewer's judgment perhaps has been skewed by having read the breathlessly enthousiastic review of *The University Game* Professor Seeley himself provided some weeks ago in the week-end Toronto *Globe and Mail*, an exercise which led one reader of the paper to write the editor enquiring when he might expect to find a laudatory review of *The Smug Minority* offered by Pierre Berton.

One of the more worthwhile essays in the volume has been contributed by George Grant on *The University Curriculum*. In it, Professor Grant easily maintains his reputation as one of the Peck's bad boys of the Canadian university scene. Beginning from the rather arbitrary, and certainly arguable, premise that "the curriculum is the essence of the university", he engages in a rapid-fire analysis and critique of the contemporary university as the "kept" woman of our state capitalist technocracy. According to Professor Grant, the contemporary university is an institution whose chief job is the cultivation of those sciences which issue in the mastery of human and non-human nature.

In the course of his critique, he gets in some deft jabs at contemporary quantification-oriented behavioural science and the whole cult of value-free social science. In short, what is provided is an account of *la trahison des clercs* already familiar to readers of Grant's earlier writings, but this time focussed on the defects of contemporary university curricula. The judgment he makes is very bleak indeed :

> "... our present forms of existence have sapped the ability to think about standards of excellence and yet at the same time have imposed on us a standard in terms of which the human good is monolithically asserted. Thus, the university curriculum, by the very studies it incorporates, guarantees that there should be no serious criticism of itself or of the society it is shaped to serve. We are unable seriously to judge the university without judging its essence, the curriculum; but since we are educated in terms of that curriculum it guaranteed that most of us will judge it as good. The criteria by which we could judge it as inadequate in principle can only be provided by those who through some chance have moved outside the society by memory or by thought. But so to have moved means that one's criticisms will not be taken seriously from within the society." (pp. 66-67.)

The gloom is only slightly relieved by Professor Grant's concluding plea for the re-discovery of human excellence by those who are somehow able, even in the midst of the present tight circle, to assert the beneficence of nature.

An essay to be read in conjunction with Professor Grant's is the one submitted by Trevor Lloyd on *The Impersonal University*. Professor Lloyd, who teaches history at the University of Toronto, stands out among the authors in this volume as one who supports in large measure the impersonality of the contemporary university. Aware that many people complain about the impersonality of the university, he says that as far as he can see this impersonality is the inevitable result of some very desirable qualities of the modern university. The enthousiasm of today's university for the pursuit of abstract truth, a pursuit which is destined never to end and one which inevitably develops an over-riding concern for teaching a method of work and a technique for studying the world (rather than for providing a system of knowledge which explains everything) inevitably produces an impersonal world. Clearly, Professors Grant and Lloyd are yearning for quite different kinds of worlds in which to live.

The best essay in the volume, in this reviewer's judgment, is that contributed by Donald J. McCullough under the title, *The Community of the University*. Dr. McCulloch, Chairman of the Department of Social and Community Psychiatry at the University of Toronto and a Director of the Students' Advisory Board there, is a sensitive and experienced analyst of the negative impact on humans of institutional impersonality, unhappily so well exemplified in the contemporary large university. Unlike Professor Lloyd, however, McCulloch is not in favour of impersonality and not content to leave it. He is anxious to establish true community by a radical transformation of person-to-person relations in the university.

He admits that the odds are long and that numerous previous attempts to re-humanize organizations have ended in failure. However, he insists with quiet force that we must continue to try. As he says : "It is critical for us all what the Universities do with their problems, for what becomes of us all may depend on what the Universities become" (p. 38). For those who share his concern, and I think that we all should, his reflections of the problem deserve careful consideration.

The other essays in the volume, including two rather ponderous attempts at satire, failed to leave any positive impression with this reviewer.

Despite the variable quality of the contributions, the volume as a whole merits the attention of anyone concerned with the University in contemporary society. Those responsible for its publication deserve congratulations for their initiative and imagination. Although having one's mind blown is not a particularly enjoyable experience, some valuable lessons can be learned from it. The same can be said for playing the University Game. I hope many try it.

Edward J. Monahan.

NOTICE OF POSITIONS VACANT*
ANNONCE DES POSTES VACANTS*

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY. Drama Professor (Criticism and History). The Department of Drama requires an associate or assistant professor in dramatic criticism, theatre history and related subjects at the undergraduate level; programme development for graduate theatre studies. Salary will be commensurate with experience and training from $9,500 to $17,450. Appointment to commence September 1, 1968. The University is prepared to pay a removal grant of up to one month's salary for the person appointed to this position. In support of their application, candidates should submit : 1. Placement credentials 2. Curriculum vitae. Applications should be addressed to : The Dean, Faculty of Fine Arts, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

UNIVERSITY OF LETHBRIDGE. Department of Mathematics. Applications are invited for openings effective July 1, 1968 in a newly established department. Prefer applicants with a Ph.D. or Ph.D. candidates in analysis, statistics, probability or numerical analysis. Applicants in all fields considered. The 1968-1969 salary ranges are : Professor $17,500; Associate Professor $13,000 - $17,450; Assistant Professor $9,500 - $12,950. Sick leave, sabbatical leave, group life, removal allowance and pension plans are in effect. Duties consist of teaching undergraduates and participation in scholarly work. Address inquiries to L. G. Hoye, Chairman, Department of Mathematics, University of Lethbridge, Lethbridge, Alberta.

SIR GEORGE WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY (MONTREAL). Faculty of Commerce, Department of Quantitative Methods. Applicants are invited to fill a new position at the Associate Professor Level to teach both Undergraduate and Graduate courses in Quantitative Methods; i.e. — Business Statistics, Managerial Operations Research, Business Systems Analysis, Electronic Data Processing. The candidate should ideally possess a Bachelor's Degree in Science or Engineering, a Master's Degree in Business Administration, Ph.D. or D.B.A. in Quantitative

---

* Institutions are charged for announcements of *Positions Vacant* at the rate of 75¢ per line or fraction thereof, with a minimum of $3 per notice. Notices should be sent to the Editor, C.A.U.T. *Bulletin*, Room 603, 77 Metcalfe Street, Ottawa 4, Ontario.

* Le taux de l'annonce des postes vacants est fixé à soixante-quinze cents par ligne ou fraction de ligne; le prix minimal est de trois dollars. Veuillez adresser toute annonce au directeur du *Bulletin de l'A.C.P.U.*, 77, rue Metcalfe, bureau 603, Ottawa 4, Ontario.

Methods and at least three years of teaching or business experience in this area. Salary will depend on qualifications and experience. Applications should be sent to the Chairman of the Department of Quantitative Methods and should include a list of publications, a transcript of record, *curriculum vitae* and the names of three references.

Computer Science Professorships. Full, Associate, and Assistant Professors in Computer Science or related fields required to develop and staff an undergraduate program in Computer Science. Great potential in a rapidly expanding department with a growing university. Individual research encouraged. Computers available include IBM 1620; large scale CDC 3300 with 65K words core operating under MASTER operating system with remote terminals and time sharing. Salary and full fringe benefits commensurate with experience. Apply Graham Martin, Director, Computer Center, Sir George Williams University, Montreal, Quebec.

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO. College of Education. Assistant Professor of History of Education required to lecture in Canadian educational history or related field. Duties to commence September 1, 1968. Favourable teaching load, research facilities, remuneration, and a close working arrangement with history department in faculty of arts. Candidate should have a background in history, and be familiar with historical and contemporary developments in Canadian education. Enquiries to : Robert M. Stamp, Chairman, History of Education Appointments Committee, Althouse College of Education, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario.

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA. Art History. Opening for an Instructor in Art History at $7,500 per annum, usual fringe benefits, plus one month's salary towards moving expenses. One first-year course, one advanced course, supervision of directed reading course. Field immaterial. Master's degree or equivalent essential, doctoral candidate preferred. Write Alan Gowans, Chairman, Department of Art History, University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C., Canada.

NOTICE OF PERSONS AVAILABLE FOR APPOINTMENT**

ANNONCE DES PROFESSEURS DISPONIBLES**

Box 86. Nutritionist. Candidate in May, 1968, for the Ph.D. degree (U.B.C.) in Poultry Nutrition and Physiology. Strong biochemistry interest and preparation. Thesis title "Some physiologic and dietary factors affecting plasma sterol concentration and bile acid excretion in the domestic chicken." Some teaching experience and publications. Available in June, 1968.

Box 87. Geography. Ph.D., University of London. Five years' teaching experience and research. Experience in supervising field studies and in administration. Publications. Male, 31, married, no children. Can teach China, Asia, Economic, Human and Practical Geography. Available after August, 1968.

Box 88. Political Science. B.A., Stanford University 1967, graduated *cum laude*, M.A., University of Wisconsin, 1968. Fields of study : normative political theory, public administration, comparative politics, and political and public process. Experience : teaching assistant at U. of Wisconsin, high school and research assistant.

Box 89. Asian Studies, History, Art and Languages. Specialties being Sanskrit/Vedic, Pâli, Malay, Old Javanese, History and Art History of Indian, Indonesia and Southeast Asia. Doctoral at U. of Amsterdam with judicium *cum laude*. Publications.

Box 90. History/Religion. Fields : History of Religion (Asia), Ancient History and Archeology, Comparative Mythology, Linguistics. Ph.D. in Oriental Studies, Sorbonne. Bilingual, teaching and research experience in France and U.S.A. Fulbright research scholar.

Box 91. International Law. Male, Dutch, married. Experience : university teaching, post-graduate coaching of public international law, comparative law, jurisprudence, private international law, politics and government, diplomatic history and political geography. Many publications.

Box 92. Chemistry. Ph.D., A.R.I.C. British National, aged 33, seeks university/college teaching-research position in organic or inorganic

---

** For fuller information write to the relevant Box No. at the C.A.U.T. National Office, Room 603, 77 Metcalfe St., Ottawa 4, Ontario.
Notices of person available for appointment are carried at $3 for 40 words and $4 for 50 words. Notices for insertion should be sent to the C.A.U.T. National Office.

** Toute demande de renseignements doit être adressée au numéro indiqué du casier, secrétariat de l'A.C.P.U., 77, rue Metcalfe, bureau 603, Ottawa 4, Ontario.
Le taux de l'annonce est fixé à trois dollars pour quarante mots et quatre dollars pour cinquante mots. Les annonces doivent être envoyées au secrétariat de l'A.C.P.U.

chemistry. Professional experience : 9 years' industrial, 2 years' military and 18 months' postdoctoral. A little lecturing experience. Active research interests. Available October next.

Box 93. Economics. Ph.D. in Agricultural Economics. Teaching experience in the U.S.A. and three years experience in business in India. Available immediately.

Case 94. Ingénieur (doctorat), transports, ponts et chaussés, italien, 41 ans. Expérience : de nombreuses années comme consulting engineer, bureau d'étude et direction de travaux de route, de ponts et de pipeline; actuellement expert de l'Unesco, professeur et chef du département de génie civil à l'École Polytechnique d'Alger. Connaissance parfaite du français et passable de l'anglais. Intéressé en recherche, accepterait un poste de professeur ou d'agrégé dans les disciplines suivantes : routes, chemin de fer, organisation de chantier, transports. Membre de la Fédération Européenne des Ingénieurs.

FRENCH

FRENCH LITERATURE AND ITS BACKGROUND

Edited by John Cruickshank

The six volumes in this series cover the period from the Renaissance to the present. In each volume a number of major literary figures are reassessed and seen in relationship to certain aspects of intellectual history. Each volume contains thematic background chapters (the majority written by historians of ideas) that make possible a marked concentration of literary values in the essays devoted to major writers.

To be published May 1968

Volume I

The Sixteenth Century, OPB #138

Volume III

The Eighteenth Century, OPB #139

To be published September 1968

Volume II

The Seventeenth Century, OPB #158

Volume IV

The Nineteenth Century, Part I, OPB #159

Volumes V & VI forthcoming early 1969

Paperbound. Each volume $2.25.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

70 Wynford Drive

Don Mills, Ontario

Priorité au Québec dans l'Atlas du Monde Contemporain

ENFIN UNE INNOVATION !

l'Atlas du Monde Contemporain

Par Pierre Gourou, Fernand Grenier et Louis-Edmond Hamelin

un guide d'utilisation et un cahier d'exercice paraîtront dès cette année

1. Le premier ATLAS qui fasse à la Province de Québec et au Canada la place qui leur revient. Sur un total de 80 pages de cartes en cinq couleurs, près du tiers leur sont consacrées. Ces cartes nouvelles ont été réalisées par les géographes suivants de l'INSTITUT DE GÉOGRAPHIE DE L'UNIVERSITÉ LAVAL :

Robert BERGERON	*John M. CROWLEY*	*Jacques LETARTE*
Paul BUSSIÈRES	*Henri DORION*	*Hugues MORISSETTE*
Pierre CAZALIS	*Fernand GRENIER*	*Louis TROTIER*
Peter B. CLIBBON	*Louis-Edmond HAMELIN*	*Cinthia V. WILSON*

2. D'une conception entièrement nouvelle, cet atlas comporte les informations géographiques, politiques, économiques et statistiques les plus récentes. Il sera, pour chacun, un auxiliaire précieux qui répondra quotidiennement aux questions que pose la vie moderne.
Huit pages de photographies en couleurs, véritable tour du monde, forment une saisissante illustration de la TERRE DES HOMMES.
Quatre ATLAS en UN • Un Atlas de géographie générale • Un Atlas mondial • Un Atlas régional • Un Atlas pour le Québec et le Canada.
3. Présentation soignée • Des cartes et des cartons simples • Des cartes précises • Des cartes lisibles • Des cartes à jour • Un index complet.
4. Cet atlas est tout spécialement destiné aux élèves du cours secondaire et des CEGEP.
5. Cet Atlas se vend à prix très modique.

Au 20e siècle, on ne peut vivre sans un ATLAS sous la main.

• *Format : 10 x 14 pouces* • *Nombre de pages : 112* • *Prix : $7.50*

ÉDITIONS DU RENOUVEAU PÉDAGOGIQUE

3300, BOULEVARD ROSEMONT, MONTRÉAL 36, TÉL. : 725-5257

Your world is waiting. Your wings are Air Canada's all North America. Here's how to see more of your

Eleven ways to save money when

EUROPE

Air Canada flies to London, Vienna, Shannon, Paris, Zurich, Glasgow, Copenhagen, Frankfurt, Moscow.

1 **14-21 DAY ECONOMY EXCURSION** — Avoid the peak travel periods (only about 7 weeks out of 52) and fly on Air Canada's 14-21 day Economy Excursion. Here are some sample round trip fares to show you how little it costs to see Europe.

Montreal to Paris: **$335.** Toronto to London: **$345.** Vancouver to Vienna: **$644.**

2 **SUMMER SEASON ECONOMY FARES** — Three weeks in Europe not enough? Here's a bargain for you summer travellers. Stay as long as you like, up to one year. Sample round trip fares:

Montreal to Paris: **$536.** Toronto to London: **$537.** Vancouver to Vienna: **$869.**

3 **THRIFT SEASON ECONOMY FARES** — If you can travel outside the busy summer period (late May to early August) you can do even better, on a Thrift Season economy fare. Your ticket is good for a whole year. Sample round trip fares:

Montreal to Paris: **$445.** Toronto to London: **$444.** Vancouver to Vienna: **$776.**

4 **14-21 DAY INDIVIDUAL TOUR-BASING FARES** — This is the very lowest fare to Europe for individual travellers. Fly any time except for a few weeks in mid-summer. The only stipulation is that you must book at least $76 worth of ground arrangements (hotel accommodations, sightseeing, meals or car rentals) through your Travel Agent, before you go. Sample tour prices:

Montreal to Paris: **$379*** Toronto to London: **$389*** Vancouver to Vienna: **$688***

5 **14-21 DAY GROUP INCLUSIVE TOUR FARES** — You have to see your Travel Agent for this one. Ask him to include you in a group of travellers (15 or more) and fly for the lowest of all scheduled fares, in a package which includes $76 worth of ground arrangements. Sample tour prices:

Montreal to Paris: **$331*** Toronto to London: **$355*** Vancouver to Vienna: **$495***

6 **AFFINITY GROUP FARES** — Here's a money-saving idea from Air Canada that's tailored for teachers. An "affinity group" is 25 or more people belonging to an organization — a teachers association, for instance. Get a group together and fly anywhere in Europe — when you get there, you're on your own. (You must fly back as a group.) There are three Affinity Group fares, one for summer, one for winter, and a special summer fare for groups of 50 or more. You can take your spouse and children along for the same low rates. Sample round trip fares:

Summer — 25 or more: Montreal to Paris: **$335.**

Winter — 25 or more: Toronto to London: **$319.**

Summer — 50 or more: Vancouver to Vienna: **$436.**

7 **EXTRA CITIES PLAN** — In most cases, a round trip ticket to a European city lets you fly to several other cities without spending a penny extra. Fly to Vienna, for example, then visit Copenhagen, Frankfurt, Brussels, Amsterdam, Paris, London, and a dozen others. (In a few cases, the Extra Cities plan doesn't apply to Group Inclusive Tour fares or to groups of 50 or more).

*21-day round trip air fare included.

special low fares to Europe, the Caribbean and beautiful world by spending less to get there.

you fly with AIR CANADA

FLORIDA & THE ISLANDS

8 **21 DAY ECONOMY CLASS EXCURSION** — Fly South to a sun-soaked holiday and save up to 20% on Air Canada's low summer rates. Miami, Tampa/St. Petersburg, or choose your island — Air Canada serves Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Antigua, Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago. Sample round trip fares:

Montreal to Barbados: **$230.** Toronto to Trinidad: **$250.** Vancouver to Jamaica: **$336.**

9 **ISLAND HOPPING HOLIDAYS** — Why see just one island, when you can visit several on a 16 day Island Hopping Holiday. Air Canada offers you a choice of three all-inclusive tours. Each takes you to a different group of islands, and you fly for much less than you'd expect.

The Buccaneer Tour: Jamaica and the Bahamas **$337.**

The Creole Tour: Antigua, Martinique and Guadeloupe **$328.**

The Calypso Tour: Trinidad, Tobago, Barbados and Grenada **$293.**

(Prices are quoted per person, double hotel room occupancy. Air fare extra.)

NORTH AMERICA

10 **GROUP TRAVEL** — Have lots of foot-loose friends? Get ten or more of them together. Then go anywhere in Canada or the United States on Air Canada's Group Travel plan and save up to 17% on Economy Class fares. If you wish, you can come back separately. Sample group fares, round trip — per person:

Montreal to Tampa: **$138.** Toronto to Calgary: **$156.** Vancouver to New York: **$232.**

11 **AIR CANADA'S FAMILY FARE PLANS** make it a lot easier for you and your family to travel together, anywhere in North America. For full information on fare discounts for wives and children, call Air Canada, or see you Travel Agent.

Want more details? Here's a list of Air Canada's special fares. Check off the one(s) which interest you, and mail to

Air Canada,
P.O. Box 598,
Montreal 3, P.Q.

EUROPE

- ☐ 14-21 Day Economy Excursion
- ☐ Summer Season Economy Fares
- ☐ Thrift Season Economy Fares
- ☐ 14-21 Day Individual Tour-Basing Fare
- ☐ 14-21 Day Group Inclusive Tour Fare
- ☐ Affinity Group Fare
- ☐ Extra Cities Plan

FLORIDA AND THE ISLANDS

- ☐ 21 Day Economy Class Excursion
- ☐ Island Hopping Holidays

NORTH AMERICA

- ☐ Group Travel
- ☐ Family Fare Plans

Name_____
(PLEASE PRINT)

Address_____ Apt._____

City_____ Zone____ Prov._____

CAUT '68